

VOLUME 9. Triple Part 1/3  
pp. 1-106.

15th October 1952

# THE BULLETIN OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

16 OCT 1952

The Official Organ of  
**THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON  
ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE**

Edited by  
**FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E.**  
*Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*

## CONTENTS :

	Page
Editorial Note regarding the arrangements made in regard to the Subjects to be dealt with in volumes 8 and 9 respectively ..	1
<i>Notices prescribed by International Congress of Zoology :</i>	
Date of commencement by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature of voting on applications published in the <i>Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature</i> .. .. .	2
Notice of the possible use by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature of its plenary powers in certain cases .. .. .	2

(continued on back wrapper)

## LONDON :

Printed by Order of the International Trust for  
Zoological Nomenclature  
and

Sold on behalf of the International Commission by the  
International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature  
at the Publications Office of the Trust  
41, Queen's Gate, London, S.W.7.

1952

Price One Pound Thirteen Shillings  
(All rights reserved)

## INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

### A. The Officers of the Commission

*Honorary Life President* : Dr. Karl Jordan (United Kingdom)

*President* : (Vacant)

*Vice-President & Acting President* : Senhor Dr. Afranio do Amaral (Brazil)

*Secretary* : Mr. Francis Hemming (United Kingdom)

### B. The Members of the Commission

(Arranged in order of precedence by reference to date of election or of most recent re-election, as prescribed by the International Congress of Zoology)

Senhor Dr. Afranio do Amaral (Brazil) (*Vice-President*) (1st January 1944)

Professor J. R. Dymond (Canada) (1st January 1944)

Professor J. Chester Bradley (U.S.A.) (28th March 1944)

Professor Harold E. Vokes (U.S.A.) (23rd April 1944)

Dr. William Thomas Calman (United Kingdom) (1st January 1947)

Professor Bela Hankó (Hungary) (1st January 1947)

Dr. Norman R. Stoll (U.S.A.) (1st January 1947)

Professor H. Boschma (Netherlands) (1st January 1947)

Senor Dr. Angel Cabrera (Argentina) (27th July 1948)

Mr. Francis Hemming (United Kingdom) (*Secretary*) (27th July 1948)

Dr. Joseph Pearson (Australia) (27th July 1948)

Dr. Henning Lemche (Denmark) (27th July 1948)

Professor Teiso Esaki (Japan) (17th April 1950)

Professor Pierre Bonnet (France) (9th June 1950)

Mr. Norman Denbigh Riley (United Kingdom) (9th June 1950)

Professor Tadeusz Jaczewski (Poland) (15th June 1950)

Professor Robert Mertens (Germany) (5th July 1950)

Professor Erich Martin Hering (Germany) (5th July 1950)

### C. The Staff of the Secretariat of the Commission

*Honorary Secretary* : Mr. Francis Hemming, C.M.G., C.B.E.

*Honorary Personal Assistant to the Secretary* : Mrs. M. F. W. Hemming

*Honorary Archivist* : Mr. Francis J. Griffin, A.L.A.

### D. The Staff of the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature

*Honorary Secretary and Managing Director* : Mr. Francis Hemming, C.M.G., C.B.E.

*Honorary Registrar* : Mr. A. S. Pankhurst

*Publications Officer* : Mrs. C. Rosner

### E. The Addresses of the Commission and the Trust

*Secretariat of the Commission* : 28, Park Village East, Regent's Park, London, N.W.1.

*Offices of the Trust* : 41, Queen's Gate, London, S.W.7



# BULLETIN OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Volume 9, Triple-Part 1/3 (pp. 1-106)

15th October 1952

## EDITORIAL NOTE REGARDING THE ARRANGEMENTS MADE IN REGARD TO THE SUBJECTS TO BE DEALT WITH IN VOLUMES 8 AND 9 OF THE "BULLETIN OF ZOO- LOGICAL NOMENCLATURE" RESPECTIVELY

In view of the fact that the Fourteenth International Congress of Zoology will meet at Copenhagen in about a year's time and that during that meeting the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature will have under consideration, and will submit recommendations to the International Congress regarding, a number of general problems relating to zoological nomenclature, it is considered that it will be for the convenience of zoologists attending the foregoing meetings, if papers on general questions of this kind are grouped together in a single volume of the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* rather than being distributed over two or more volumes where they would be intermingled with applications relating to individual names.

2. It has accordingly been decided to reserve Volume 8 of the *Bulletin* for papers on general nomenclatorial problems, this volume thus forming a companion volume to Volume 7, which is also concerned with certain of the general problems to be considered at Copenhagen next year. Within Volume 8 papers relating to the same subject received from various quarters will, so far as possible, be grouped together, thus further facilitating reference and discussion. It is hoped that the publication of this volume will start at an early date.

3. Since Volume 6 (the latest volume devoted to the publication of applications relating to individual nomenclatorial problems) has now been completed (except for Part 12 containing the Title-Page and index, which is now in preparation) and, as explained above, Volumes 7 and 8 are being reserved for general nomenclatorial problems to be discussed at Copenhagen, the present volume (Volume 9) will be devoted to applications on individual names. This volume is therefore in a sense the immediate successor of Volume 6 and will contain also comments received from specialists on applications published in that volume.

4. The present Part is issued as a Triple Part, in order to render it possible to publish as a single unit all the available applications relating to the names of birds which have been received by the Commission. The majority of these have been submitted by the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature established in 1950 by the International Ornithological Congress "to consider, on behalf of the International Ornithological Congress, problems arising in ornithological nomenclature, to formulate proposals in regard thereto designed to promote stability and uniformity in nomenclatorial practice, and, in the name of the International Congress, to present proposals, so formulated,

to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature for favourable consideration." The appointment of this Standing Committee is warmly to be welcomed, representing, as it does, exactly that type of development which the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature had in mind when at Lisbon in 1935 it adopted a Resolution expressing its earnest hope that specialists in particular groups of the Animal Kingdom would organise themselves for the study of nomenclature in their respective groups (see 1943, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **1** : 11).

(int'd) F.H.

31st August 1952.

### NOTICES PRESCRIBED BY THE INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF ZOOLOGY

The following notices are given in pursuance of decisions taken, on the recommendation of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 51-56, 57-59), by the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, Paris, July 1948 (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **5** : 5-13, 131).

#### **(a) Date of commencement by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature of voting on applications published in the "Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature"**

NOTICE is hereby given that normally the International Commission will start to vote upon applications published in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* on the expiry of a period of six calendar months from the date of publication in the *Bulletin* of the applications in question. Any specialist who may desire to comment upon any of the applications published in the present Triple-Part (Vol. 9, Triple-Part 1/3) of the *Bulletin* is accordingly invited to do so in writing to the Secretary to the Commission, as quickly as possible and in any case, in sufficient time to enable the communication in question to reach the Secretariat of the Commission before the expiry of the six-month period referred to above.

#### **(b) Notice of the possible use by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature of its plenary powers in certain cases**

NOTICE is hereby given that the possible use by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature of its plenary powers is involved in



**Notices prescribed by the International Congress of Zoology (continued)**

applications published in the present Part of the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* (Vol. 9, Triple-Part 1/3) in relation to the following names of birds :—

- (1) *Colymbus* Linnaeus, 1758, and *Gavia* (all uses prior to *Gavia* Forster, 1788), suppression of (Z.N.(S.)78) ;
- (2) *caspicus* Hablizl, 1783 (*Colymbus*), suppression of (Z.N.(S.)525) ;
- (3) *cafra* (Otis), *cafer* (*Cuculus*), *sulphuratus* (*Cuculus*), *flavescens* (*Lanius*), all of Lichtenstein, 1793, suppression of (Z.N.(S.)526) ;
- (4) *nortoniensis* Gmelin, 1789 (*Fringilla*), suppression of (Z.N.(S.)527) ;
- (5) *natka* (*Lanius*) and *septentrionalis* (*Lanius*), both of Gmelin, 1788, and *eimeensis* (*Columba*), *unalaschkensis* (*Hirundo*), *borealis* (*Motacilla*), *cirrhatu*s (*Pelecanus*), *australis* (*Sterna*), all of Gmelin, 1789, suppression of (Z.N.(S.)454) ;
- (6) *phaeus* (*Turdus*), *elegans* (*Motacilla*), *chlorotis* (*Muscicapa*), all of Forster, 1794, and *novae-hollandiae* Latham, 1790 (*Muscicapa*), suppression of (Z.N.(S.)494) ;
- (7) *Pyrhocorax* Tunstall, 1771, validation of, for the Chough (Z.N.(S.)492) ;
- (8) *philomelos* Brehm, 1831 (*Turdus*), validation of, for the Song Thrush (Z.N.(S.)496) ;
- (9) generic name *Vermivora* and trivial names *lutea* (*Muscicapa*), *pennsylvanica* [sic] (*Passer*), *americ.* [sic] (*Vermivora*), all of Linnaeus, 1776, suppression of (Z.N.(S.)502) ;
- (10) *Columba migratoria* Linnaeus, 1766, validation of, for the Passenger Pigeon (Z.N.(S.)572) ;
- (11) *Bubo* Duméril, 1806, *Coturnix* Bonnaterre, 1790, *Egretta* Forster, 1817, *Oriolus* Linnaeus, 1766, validation of, by suppression of senior homonyms published by Brisson in 1760 (Z.N.(S.)701) ;
- (12) *Capella* Frenzel, 1801, validation of, by suppression of *Gallinago* Brisson, 1760 (Z.N.(S.)575) ;
- (13) *Myiobius* Darwin, 1839, validation of, and designation of type species for, in harmony with current practice (Z.N.(S.)676) ;
- (14) *cyanea* Hume, 1877 (*Muscitrea*), validation of, by suppression of *cyanea* Vieillot, 1818 (*Muscicapa*) (Z.N.(S.)686) ;
- (15) *ferruginea* Hodgson, 1845 (*Hemichelidon*), validation of, by suppression of *ferruginea* Merrem, 1784 (*Muscicapa*) (Z.N.(S.)687).

2. In accordance with the arrangement agreed upon at the Session held by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature in Paris in 1948 (see *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 4 : 56) corresponding Notices have been issued to the serial publications "Nature" and "Science."

FRANCIS HEMMING,

Secretary to the International Commission  
on Zoological Nomenclature.

28 Park Village East,  
Regent's Park, LONDON, N.W.1.  
15th October 1952,

## **ESTABLISHMENT BY THE TENTH INTERNATIONAL ORNITHOLOGICAL CONGRESS OF A STANDING COMMITTEE ON ORNITHOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE**

Letter dated 20th October, 1951, from Colonel R. Meinertzhagen,  
Chairman of the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature  
of the International Ornithological Congress

**(Z.N.(G.)25)**

I write to inform you, as Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, of certain important decisions taken by the International Ornithological Congress at its meeting held at Uppsala in June, 1950, with the object of promoting stability in ornithological nomenclature.

I have to explain that, after a general discussion at one of the plenary sessions, at which the view was strongly expressed that there was an urgent need for devising effective means for bringing before the International Commission the collective wishes of the ornithologists represented at the Congress, it was decided that a further meeting, open to all members of the Congress, should be held for the purpose of drawing up, on behalf of the Congress, a definite plan for communication to the International Commission. This further meeting, which was attended by a large number of members of the Congress and was thoroughly representative in character, decided that there should be established forthwith, as a Permanent Committee of the Congress, a Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature, charged with the duty of acting as the representative of the Congress in submitting proposals relating to ornithological nomenclature to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature.

The duties entrusted to the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature are :—

To consider, on behalf of the International Ornithological Congress, problems arising in ornithological nomenclature, to formulate proposals in regard thereto designed to promote stability and uniformity in nomenclatorial practice, and, in the name of the International Congress, to transmit proposals, so formulated, to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature for favourable consideration.

The Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature, of which I was appointed to act as the Chairman and intermediary between the Committee and the International Commission, is composed as follows :—

1. Colonel R. Meinertzhagen (Great Britain) (*Chairman*).
2. Professor E. Stresemann, Zoological Museum, Berlin (Germany).
3. Dr. J. Berlioz, National Museum of Natural History, Paris (France).
4. Dr. J. T. Zimmer, American Museum of Natural History, New York (U.S.A.).

*Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, Vol. 9 (October 1952)



A number of important and urgent problems are already under consideration by the Standing Committee, which hopes to be in a position to submit a preliminary group of proposals to the International Commission at a very early date. I am to express the hope of the Standing Committee and of the Congress generally that the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature will find it possible to deal promptly with applications submitted to it by the Standing Committee, for the value of the decisions taken will largely depend upon the speed with which they can be obtained.

**PROPOSED USE OF THE PLENARY POWERS TO PUT  
AN END TO THE CONFUSION ARISING FROM THE DIS-  
CORDANT USE OF THE GENERIC NAME "COLYMBUS"  
LINNAEUS, 1758 (CLASS AVES)**

**Application submitted by the  
Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature of the  
International Ornithological Congress**

**(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)78)**

Covering letter, with enclosure, dated 19th October 1950, from Colonel R. Meinertzhagen, Chairman of the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature of the International Ornithological Congress.

As Chairman of the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature, I beg to forward to you the following recommendation relating to the generic name *Colymbus* Linnaeus, 1758, for favour of decision by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature.

For many years the name *Colymbus* Linnaeus has given rise to great confusion in ornithological nomenclature, for, owing to the lack of an authoritative ruling as to the type species of this genus, the generic name *Colymbus*, the family name COLYMBIDAE, and the ordinal name Colymbiformes have been used by one school of ornithologists for the Divers (Loons) and by another for the Grebes.

From a preliminary discussion which took place first at one of the Plenary Sessions of the Ninth International Ornithological Congress at Uppsala in July 1950 and later at a special meeting, open to all members of the Congress, held at the suggestion of the Congress at one of its Plenary Sessions, it was apparent that there was an overwhelming desire, on the part of the ornithologists present, to secure a final settlement of the long-standing *Colymbus* controversy.

The *Colymbus* problem was therefore among the first to which consideration was given by the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature. The recommendations now submitted represent, in the unanimous opinion of the Standing Committee, the best solution that is now obtainable and the one calculated to secure the widest possible measure of support from ornithologists of all schools of thought.



## ENCLOSURE

**Proposals in regard to the generic name "Colymbus"  
Linnaeus, 1758, submitted to the International Commission  
on Zoological Nomenclature**

The Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature of the International Ornithological Congress recommend the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature :—

(1) to use its plenary powers :—

- (a) to suppress the generic name *Colymbus* Linnaeus, 1758 (*Syst. Nat.* (ed.10) 1 : 135) for the purposes of Article 25 (Law of Priority) but not for those of Article 34 (Law of Homonymy) ;
- (b) to set aside all type selections hitherto made for the under-mentioned genera and to designate, as their respective type species, the species specified below :—

<i>Name of Species</i>	<i>Species designated as type species</i>
<i>Gavia</i> Forster, 1788, <i>Enchiridion Hist.</i> <i>nat.</i> 38	<i>Colymbus immer</i> Brünnich, 1764, <i>Orn. boreal.</i> 38
<i>Podiceps</i> Latham, 1787, <i>Gen. Synopsis Birds</i> , Suppl. 1 : 294	<i>Colymbus cristatus</i> Linnaeus 1758, <i>Syst. Nat.</i> (ed. 10) 1 : 135

- (2) to place on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* the generic names *Gavia* Forster, 1788, and *Podiceps* Latham, 1787, with, as their respective type species, the species so designated in (1) above ;
- (3) to place the under-mentioned trivial names on the *Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology* ;—
  - (a) *cristatus* Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Colymbus cristatus*)
  - (b) *immer* Brünnich, 1764 (as published in the binominal combination *Colymbus immer*) ;
- (4) to place the generic name *Colymbus* Linnaeus, 1758, on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology*.

R. MEINERTZHAGEN, *Chairman of the Standing Committee.*

J. BERLIOZ, *Museum National d'Histoire Naturelle, Paris.*

E. STRESEMANN, *Zoologisches Museum der Universität, Berlin.*

JOHN T. ZIMMER, *The American Museum of Natural History,  
New York.*

**REPORT ON THE PROBLEMS RAISED BY THE GENERIC NAME "COLYMBUS" LINNAEUS, 1758 (CLASS AVES)**

By FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E.

*(Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature)***(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)78)**

At its Session held in Paris in 1948 the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature had under consideration the problems raised by the generic name *Colymbus* Linnaeus, 1758 (*Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) 1 : 135) (Class Aves). Differences of opinion among ornithologists as to whether *Colymbus arcticus* Linnaeus, 1758, a Diver (Loon) or *Colymbus cristatus* Linnaeus, 1758, a Grebe, was, or should be accepted as being, the type species of the genus has divided ornithologists for three full generations and has led to the most serious confusion and lack of uniformity not only at the genus-name level but also at the family-name and Ordinal-name levels. By the time of the Paris Session, the International Commission itself had had this matter under consideration for twenty-two years, an application on this subject having been submitted to it by the late Dr. (subsequently Commissioner) Witmer Stone (*Academy of Natural Sciences of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, U.S.A.*) as far back as 1926. No progress of any kind had however been made towards securing a settlement of this question.

2. At Paris the Commission came to the conclusion that the views held on this subject by the two opposing groups of ornithologists were so strongly held and the practice of each so deeply entrenched that there seemed little prospect of realising the hope that it had long entertained that ornithologists generally or at least a representative group of ornithologists would come forward with agreed proposals designed to restore uniformity and stability in this branch of ornithological nomenclature. The Commission concluded, therefore, that its proper course was to reach with as little further delay as possible a decision on the issue submitted to it by Dr. Witmer Stone in 1926. The Commission decided, as a first step, to obtain a report on the nomenclatorial issues involved from "a zoologist who was an authority on nomenclature but was not himself an ornithologist and who therefore had not had to prejudge the question in the course of his own work." Having reached this decision, the International Commission invited me to undertake this task in a personal capacity and I agreed to do so (1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 4 : 361-362). The procedure so agreed upon was reported to, and approved by, the Section on Nomenclature of the Congress and by the Congress itself in Plenary Session.

3. In view of the importance of making progress with this case as rapidly as possible, I began the investigation entrusted to me not long after the close of the Paris meeting. When I came to examine in detail the arguments that had been advanced at different times by various ornithologists, I realised that I could not complete my Report until the *Official Record of the Proceedings* in Paris had been agreed upon in the prescribed manner, for it was evident that, in order to put into their proper perspective some of the arguments which had been advanced in regard to the present case, it would be necessary to quote from the *Official Record* passages containing decisions taken in Paris in regard



to aspects of the *Règles*, the meaning of which had previously been open to doubt and which had a material bearing on the question referred to me for report.

4. The *Official Record of the Proceedings* in Paris was approved in January 1950, and I should thereupon have completed my Report and submitted it to the International Commission had it not been for the fact that I then received a letter from Commissioner Henning Lemche (*Universitetets Zoologiske Museum, Copenhagen*) informing me that his attention had been drawn by the Danish ornithologist Dr. Finn Salomonsen to certain proposals for an agreed settlement of the *Colymbus* problem which had been put forward by Dr. Erwin Stresemann (*Berlin*) at the International Ornithological Congress held at Oxford in 1934; no definite action in this matter had transpired either then or subsequently, but an International Ornithological Congress, the first since the war, was due to be held in Sweden at Uppsala later that year (1950), and it was possible that this question might be brought before that Congress. I regarded this suggestion as extremely valuable and one calculated to provide a solution of the *Colymbus* problem along the lines long desired by the Commission but so far never secured, namely through the presentation to the Commission by ornithologists themselves of a proposal for the solution of this problem. Later, I learnt, through Commissioner Lemche, that Dr. Salomonsen had himself decided to bring this matter before the Uppsala Congress, and he kindly furnished me with a copy of the communication which he proposed to make to that Congress on this subject.

5. Dr. Salomonsen's decision to lay this matter before the Ornithological Congress created an entirely new situation, for, if that Congress were to agree upon proposals for submission to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, the narrow issue on which in 1948 I had been invited to make a report might become of academic interest only. I accordingly decided to complete that Report but to withhold its submission to the Commission until after the meeting of the International Ornithological Congress at Uppsala later that year.

6. Shortly after the close of the Uppsala Congress I was informed by Colonel Richard Meinertzhagen that Dr. Salomonsen had duly presented his paper, that there had been a considerable discussion of a preliminary nature in regard to this and other individual cases of ornithological nomenclature at a public meeting specially convened for the purpose, that no decisions had been taken in regard to the name *Colymbus*, but that it had been decided to establish a Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature under his Chairmanship, that that Committee would as soon as possible take into detailed consideration the proposal in regard to the name *Colymbus* submitted to the Uppsala Congress by Dr. Salomonsen and that he hoped to be able to submit the recommendations of the Standing Committee on this case to the International Commission at an early date. On 19th October 1950 Colonel Meinertzhagen informed me by letter that the Standing Committee was unanimously agreed in asking the International Commission to use its plenary powers in such a way as to secure that, through the suppression of the name *Colymbus* Linnaeus, 1758, the oldest available generic names for the Grebes and the Divers should be *Podiceps* Latham, 1787, and *Gavia* Forster, 1788, respectively.

7. When the application from the Standing Committee was submitted to the customary routine examination, I found references to a generic name *Gavia* which, if an available name, would have had priority over the name *Gavia* Forster, 1788, the name recommended by the Standing Committee for stabilisation as the generic name for the Divers. The name in question was *Gavia* Nozemann & Vosmaer, 1758 (in Moehring, *Gesluch. Vogel.*: 5, 54), a name more commonly (though incorrectly) known as *Gavia* Moehring. Prior to the Session of the International Commission held in Paris in 1948, there was some doubt as to whether or not new names published in the Dutch edition of Moehring's *Avium Genera* prepared by Nozemann & Vosmaer and published in 1758 under the title *Geslachten der Vogelen* were available names. In Paris, however, the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature examined this question and decided that the names in this post-1757 edition of Moehring's pre-1758 work had not been reinforced by adoption or acceptance, as prescribed originally in *Opinion* 5 and, since the Paris Congress in the *Règles* themselves (1950 *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4**: 150), and therefore that those names possessed no rights in zoological nomenclature (1950, *ibid.* **4**: 566-568). Thus, the alleged name *Gavia* Nozemann & Vosmaer, 1758, does not preoccupy the name *Gavia* Forster, 1788, for the Divers. In order to dispose of this matter once and for all, it will, however, be desirable that *Gavia* Nozemann & Vosmaer, 1758, should be placed on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* with (as in similar cases) a note as to why this name is invalid.

8. The routine investigation of this case disclosed also the existence of three generic names consisting of the word *Gavia*, each published subsequent to *Gavia* Forster, 1788. The names in question are: (1) *Gavia* Oken, 1816, *Lehrbuch Naturgesch.* **3** (Zool.) (2): 537; (2) *Gavia* Boie, 1822, Oken's *Isis* **10**: 563; (3) *Gavia* Gloger, 1842, *Hand-und Hilfsbuch Naturgesch.* **1**: 433. In accordance with the direction given to the International Commission by the International Congress of Zoology that decisions on individual applications are in future to cover all aspects of the problems submitted, the foregoing names should be added to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* at the same time that the name *Gavia* Forster, 1788, is placed on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*, if the proposal to that end submitted by the Standing Committee on Ornithology is approved by the International Commission. At the same time there should also be added to the *Official Index* the two junior homonyms of *Colymbus* Linnaeus, 1758, namely: (1) *Colymbus* Paetel, 1875 (*Fam. Gatt. Moll.*: 50); (2) *Colymbus* Hadding, 1913 (*Univ. Arssk. Lund* (n.f.) **9**(2) (No. 15): 79).

9. During his last visit to England, Dr. Ernst Mayr (*The American Museum of Natural History, New York*) drew my attention to the reference by Hartert (1915, *Die Vögel paläarkt. Fauna* (2): 1456) to a generic name consisting of the word *Gavia* of older date than *Gavia* Forster, 1788, and suggested that this was a matter which should be investigated before the application relating to the *Colymbus* problem was considered by the International Commission. In the work referred to by Dr. Mayr, Hartert applied the name *Colymbus* Linnaeus, 1758, to the Divers, treating *Colymbus arcticus* Linnaeus, 1758, as the type species. As in the case of other nominal genera recognised by him



as representing taxonomically valid genera, Hartert cited under the name *Colymbus* Linnaeus, the names of nominal genera of later date which he regarded as junior synonyms. The first such entry reads as follows:—" *Gavia* Forster 1788—non S. G. Gmelin 1770!" It is unfortunate that Hartert did not cite a bibliographical reference for the name *Gavia* Gmelin, 1770, for this name is not noted either by Sherborn in his *Index Animalium* or by Neave in *Nomenclator Zoologicus*, and it has proved a matter of some difficulty to trace the original reference to it. This reference has however kindly been supplied by Dr. Mayr (*in litt.*, 8th August 1952). It is as follows: *Gavia* Gmelin (S.G.), 1770, *Reise durch Russland zur Untersuchung der drey Natur-Reiche* 1: 152. This name was there used by Gmelin for a gull. (In furnishing this information, Dr. Mayr drew attention to the fact that, although the name *Gavia* is not now used for any genus of gull, it was frequently so used in the XIXth Century and that this word or its stem appears in a number of compound words which have been published for genera of gulls, e.g. *Gavina* Bonaparte, 1854; *Bruchigavia* Bonaparte, 1855; *Gabianus* Bruch, 1853.)

10. At the same time that Dr. Mayr furnished the foregoing information, he drew attention also to the fact that the first use in the literature of the word *Gavia* as a generic name was by Brisson in 1760 (*Ornithologie* 6: 196). Brisson clearly did not apply the principles of binominal nomenclature in his *Ornithologie*—he was what in past times was called a "binary author"—but that work is of importance in ornithology and it is for this reason that in its *Opinion* 37 (1911, *Smithson Publ.* 2013: 87-88) the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature ruled in favour of the acceptance, as available, of new generic names published in the *Ornithologie* and this ruling was validated and confirmed in 1948 (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 4: 65). It is evident therefore that the name *Gavia* Brisson, 1760, will need to be disposed of, if the recommendation by the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature is to be accepted. The fact that, as is now established, the word *Gavia* was used as a generic name at least twice (Brisson, 1760; Gmelin (S.G.), 1770) before it was so used by Forster in 1788 suggests the possibility that more intensive bibliographical investigations might bring to light some other use of *Gavia* as a generic name prior to Forster, 1788. In these circumstances, the only means by which an unchallengeable title could be provided for *Gavia* Forster, 1788, would be for the International Commission, when accepting that name for the divers, to adopt a procedure similar to that employed when in similar circumstances it was desired to give an impregnable position to the generic name *Spatangus* Gray, 1825 (Class Echinoidea) (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 4: 526), that is, that the International Commission should use its plenary powers for the purpose of suppressing for the purposes both of the Law of Priority and of the Law of Homonymy all uses of the word *Gavia* as a generic name prior to *Gavia* Forster, 1788. At the same time it would be necessary to add to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* the two names (consisting of the word *Gavia* (i.e. *Gavia* Brisson, 1760; *Gavia* Gmelin (S.G.), 1770) which are known to have been published before *Gavia* Forster, 1788.

11. Finally, it is necessary to note that under a decision taken by the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology at Paris in 1948 it is necessary,

when any name is placed on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*, to note against that name the gender of the word of which that name is composed (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 341). Such entries will therefore be needed, if, as proposed by the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature, the names *Podiceps* Latham, 1787, and *Gavia* Forster, 1788, are now to be added to the *Official List*. The gender of the first of these names is masculine, that of the second, feminine.

**12.** I have consulted Colonel Meinertzhagen on the problem raised by the discovery of the generic names *Gavia* Brisson, 1760, *Gavia* Gmelin, 1770, and on the minor matters raised in paragraphs 7 and 8 of this Report, having communicated to him for this purpose a copy of this Report in draft. In reply, Colonel Meinertzhagen has since informed me that he is in full agreement with the action suggested in paragraphs 7, 8, 10, and 11 above which, as Chairman of the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature, he considers necessary and desirable for the purpose of giving effect to the proposal submitted to the International Commission by the Standing Committee under cover of his letter of 19th October 1950. In agreement with Colonel Meinertzhagen I have therefore prepared the revised form of request annexed to the present Report as Appendix 1. This form of request Colonel Meinertzhagen asks should be treated as constituting a textual revision of the application already submitted by the Standing Committee of which he is the Chairman. The Report on the narrow issue of the present position of *Colymbus* Linnaeus, 1758, under the *Règles*, which, as explained in paragraph 2 of the present Report, was prepared in response to the request addressed to me in 1948, is submitted as Appendix 2. It is submitted only for information, having been superseded, as the basis of possible action by the International Commission, by the proposal received later from the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature appointed by the International Ornithological Congress.

(signed) FRANCIS HEMMING.

28 Park Village East,  
Regent's Park, London, N.W.1.  
16th August 1952.



## APPENDIX 1

APPLICATION REGARDING THE NAME "COLYMBUS"  
LINNAEUS, 1758, SUBMITTED TO THE INTERNATIONAL  
COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE BY  
THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON ORNITHOLOGICAL  
NOMENCLATURE, AS REVISED IN CERTAIN MINOR  
RESPECTS IN AGREEMENT WITH THE CHAIRMAN OF  
THE STANDING COMMITTEE

The International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is asked :—

(1) to use its plenary powers :—

- (a) to suppress the generic name *Colymbus* Linnaeus, 1758, for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy ;
- (b) to suppress for the purposes both of the Law of Priority and of the Law of Homonymy any uses of the generic name *Gavia* prior to *Gavia* Forster, 1788 ;
- (c) to set aside all type selections hitherto made for the under-mentioned nominal genera and to designate, as their respective type species the nominal species specified below :—

Name of genus	Species proposed to be designated as type species of genus specified in Col. (1)
(1)	(2)
<i>Gavia</i> Forster, 1788, <i>Enchiridion Hist. nat.</i> 38 (gender of generic name : feminine)	<i>Colymbus immer</i> , Brünnich, 1764, <i>Orn. boreal.</i> : 38
<i>Podiceps</i> Latham, 1787, <i>Suppl. gen. Synopsis Birds</i> [1] : 294 (gender of generic name : masculine)	<i>Colymbus cristatus</i> Linnaeus, 1758, <i>Syst. Nat.</i> (ed. 10) 1 : 135

(2) to place on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* the generic names *Gavia* Forster, 1788, and *Podiceps* Latham, 1787, with, as their respective type species, the species designated, as proposed in (1)(c) above ;

(3) to place the under-mentioned trivial names on the *Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology* :—

- (a) *cristatus* Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Colymbus cristatus*) (trivial name of type species of *Podiceps* Latham, 1787) ;

(b) *immer* Brünnich, 1764 (as published in the binominal combination *Colymbus immer*) (trivial name of type species of *Gavia* Forster, 1788) :

(4) to place the under-mentioned generic names on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* :—

(a) *Colymbus* Linnaeus, 1758 (*Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) **1** : 135), as proposed in (1)(a) above to be suppressed under the plenary powers) ;

(b) *Colymbus* Paetel, 1875, *Fam. Gatt. Moll.* : 50) (junior homonym of *Colymbus* Linnaeus, 1758) ;

(c) *Colymbus* Hadding, 1913 (*Univ. Arssk. Lund* (n.f.) **9**(2) (No. 15) : 79) (junior homonym of *Colymbus* Linnaeus, 1758) ;

(d) *Gavia* Brisson, 1760 (*Ornithologie* **6** : 196) (as proposed, under (1)(b) above, to be suppressed under the plenary powers) ;

(e) *Gavia* Gmelin (S. G.), 1770 (*Reise Russl.* **1** : 152) (as proposed, under (1)(b) above, to be suppressed under the plenary powers) ;

(f) *Gavia*, all other uses as a generic name prior to *Gavia* Forster, 1788 (as proposed under (1)(b) above to be suppressed under the plenary powers) ;

(g) *Gavia* Oken, 1816 (*Lehrbuch Naturgesch.* **3** (Zool.) (2) : 537) (a junior homonym of *Gavia* Forster, 1788) ;

(h) *Gavia* Boie, 1822 (Oken's *Isis* **10** : 563) (a junior homonym of *Gavia* Forster, 1788) ;

(i) *Gavia* Gloger, 1842 (*Hand-und Hilfsbuch Naturgesch.* **1** : 433) (a junior homonym of *Gavia* Forster, 1788).



## APPENDIX 2

**REPORT ON THE TYPE SPECIES OF THE NOMINAL  
GENUS "COLYMBUS" LINNAEUS, 1758, PREPARED BY  
MR. FRANCIS HEMMING IN RESPONSE TO AN INVITATION  
BY THE THIRTEENTH INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS  
OF ZOOLOGY, PARIS, 1948**

To :—

The International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

28 Park Village East,  
Regent's Park,  
London, N.W.1.

9th February 1950.

In compliance with the request addressed to me as "a zoologist who was an authority on nomenclature but was not himself an ornithologist and who therefore had not had to prejudge the question in the course of his own work" by the Section on Nomenclature of the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, Paris, 1948 (1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **5** : 153) on the recommendation of the International Commission (1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 361-362), a request later confirmed, with other recommendations submitted by the Section on Nomenclature and by the International Commission, by the International Congress in Plenary Session (1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **5** : 131), I have the honour to submit the following Report on "the question of the nominal species which, under the *Règles*, is the type species of the genus *Colymbus* Linnaeus, 1758 (Class Aves)."

**2.** When the foregoing invitation was extended to me, the urgency of the problem remitted to me for examination was strongly stressed by the International Commission. I accordingly began this investigation as soon as possible after the close of the Paris Congress. In consequence, the first draft of the present Report was completed some time ago. It has not however been possible for me until now to complete and sign this Report, for it was necessary to wait until the *Official Record of Proceedings* at Paris both of the International Commission and of the Section on Nomenclature of the Congress had been approved in the prescribed manner, since it was essential in the present Report at certain points to be able to quote from the *Official Record* passages containing decisions which had a direct bearing upon the problem remitted to me for report. Now, however, that the *Official Record* in question has been finally approved and is in page proof and I am in consequence in a position to quote the passages in question, I have completed my Report which I now submit for consideration.

**3. Arrangement of the present Report ;** In the present Report I first examine Article 30 of the *Règles*, the Article which governs the fixing of type species of nominal genera. Having thus established under which of the Rules in Article 30 the type species of the nominal genus *Colymbus* Linnaeus, 1758, falls to be determined, I examine in turn the claims which at different times have been advanced on behalf of various authors for recognition as the author

by whom the type species of this nominal genus was determined. I have not thought it either necessary or desirable to quote from the numerous papers which at different times have been published on this subject, in view especially of the fact that much of the argument adduced in the earlier of these papers is beside the point, those arguments being based upon the assumed existence of a "Law of Elimination," a method for determining the type species of genera which, as is well known, had a considerable vogue prior to the adoption in 1901 of the present *Règles*, in which, however, such a provision found no place (see paragraph 16 below).

# **1. QUESTION OF THE RULE IN ARTICLE 30 UNDER WHICH THE TYPE SPECIES OF THE NOMINAL GENUS "COLYMBUS" LINNAEUS, 1758, WAS DETERMINED**

**4. The nature of the provisions in Article 30 relating to the determination of the type species of nominal genera :** Article 30, the Article in the *Règles* which governs the determination of the type species of nominal genera, contains a series of Rules for the foregoing purpose and prescribes that these Rules are to be applied successively. Thus, in order to make a start in determining the type species of any given nominal genus, it is necessary to examine the position of that nominal genus in relation to each Rule in turn, for it is not until it has been established that the type species of such a genus was not determined under any of the preceding Rules that the position of that genus in relation to any of the later Rules has any relevance whatever. Accordingly, in the present part of this Report, I examine the position of the nominal genus *Colymbus* Linnaeus, 1758, in relation to each successive Rule in Article 30 for the purpose of ascertaining which of those Rules is applicable to that generic name.

**5. Rule (a) (type species by original designation) :** Rule (a) provides that, where the original author of a generic name himself designates a nominal species as the type species of the nominal genus so named, that action is final. When in 1758 Linnaeus published the Tenth Edition of the *Systema Naturae*, he did not designate type species for any of the nominal genera which he then established, for at that time the need for nomenclatorial purposes of such a concept as that of a "type species" for a nominal genus had not been recognised. Accordingly, Linnaeus did not in 1758 himself designate a type species for the nominal genus *Colymbus* Linnaeus. Rule (a) in Article 30 has therefore no bearing on the present case.

**6. Rule (b) (type species by indication through the use of the words "typicus" or "typus" as the trivial name of one of the included species) :** None of the nominal species referred by Linnaeus to his genus *Colymbus* bore as its trivial name either the word "*typicus*" or the word "*typus*." Rule (b) has therefore no bearing on this case.

**7. Rule (c) (type species by monotypy) :** Linnaeus placed more than one nominal species in the genus *Colymbus*. This genus is therefore not monotypical, and Rule (c) has, in consequence, no relevance to this case.

**8. Rule (d) (type species by absolute tautonymy) :** None of the nominal species referred by Linnaeus to the genus bore as its trivial name the



word "*colymbus*." In its simplest form Rule (d) therefore does not apply to the present case. Nor does this Rule so apply under either of the two extensions made by *Opinions* 16 and 18 respectively (for the current application of the former of which see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 154, and for the latter, *ibid.* **4** : 153). For none of the nominal species cited by Linnaeus as belonging to the genus *Colymbus* either (1) was then cited with a synonym consisting of a pre-1758 univocal specific name consisting of the word "*Colymbus*" (*Opinion* 16) or (2) possesses a synonym having, as its trivial name, the word "*colymbus*" (*Opinion* 18).

**9. Rule (e) :** The application of the term "Rule" to this provision is a misnomer, for it does not provide a test for determining the type species to be applied after Rule (d) and before Rule (f). All that this provision does is to deny eligibility for consideration as candidates for the status of type species to three classes of nominal species, namely (a) nominal species not included in the nominal genus concerned at the time when its name was first published ; (b) nominal species which were *species inquirendae* from the standpoint of the author of the generic name concerned ; (c) nominal species which were only doubtfully referred to the genus concerned by the author of the name of that genus. None of the species referred by Linnaeus in 1758 to the genus *Colymbus* was a *species inquirenda* from his standpoint, nor was any of those species only doubtfully referred by him to that genus. Accordingly, neither the second nor the third of the provisions contained in the so-called Rule (e) has any bearing on the question of the type species of the genus *Colymbus* Linnaeus, 1758. The first of these provisions (that which excludes from eligibility as type species any species not placed in a given genus by the original author of the generic name concerned), especially as clarified by the International Congress of Zoology in 1948 (as to which see paragraph 22 below), does, as will be seen in later parts of this Report, have an important bearing upon the validity of the arguments that have been advanced by some of those who have taken part in the discussion regarding the species to be accepted as the type species of *Colymbus* Linnaeus, 1758.

**10. Rule (f) (type species (i) of a nominal genus established to provide a name for an older nominal genus possessing an invalid name and (ii) of a nominal genus the name of which has been replaced for the foregoing reason) :** The generic name *Colymbus* Linnaeus, 1758, was not published as a substitute for the name of an older nominal genus, nor has this name ever been replaced on the ground that it was invalid. Thus, Rule (f) has no bearing upon the present case.

**11. Rule (g) (type species by subsequent selection) :** Having now examined in turn each of the Rules in Article 30 lettered (a) to (f) (both inclusive) and found that none of them is applicable to the name *Colymbus* Linnaeus, 1758, we are left only with Rule (g), the last of the mandatory provisions in the foregoing Article. We see therefore that, in order to ascertain what is the type species of the nominal genus *Colymbus* Linnaeus, 1758, it is necessary to ascertain by reference to the literature which of the species included in this genus by Linnaeus in 1758 was first selected to be the type species in a manner which satisfies the requirements of Article 30 of the *Règles*.

## II. EXAMINATION OF THE CLAIMS ADVANCED ON BEHALF OF CERTAIN AUTHORS FOR RECOGNITION AS HAVING, AT SPECIFIED DATES, BEEN THE FIRST AUTHOR VALIDLY TO SELECT A TYPE SPECIES FOR THE NOMINAL GENUS "COLYMBUS" LINNAEUS, 1758

**12.** In the present Section I examine first the conditions which under Rule (g) in Article 30 must be satisfied in order to qualify the action of any given author to rank as constituting a valid selection of a type species for a nominal genus, the type species of which has not been determined under any of the earlier Rules in the foregoing Article. In the light of the survey so made, I then examine, in turn, the claims which have at different times been advanced for the recognition of particular authors as having, on specified dates, been the first author validly to select a type species for the nominal genus *Colymbus* Linnaeus, 1758.

### (a) Provisions relating to the selection by an author of a type species for a given nominal genus prescribed in Rule (g) in Article 30 of the "Règles" and associated provisions

**13.** In order both to shorten and to simplify the later consideration of the claims which have been advanced in favour of the recognition of particular authors as having at specified dates been the first author validly to select a type species for the nominal genus *Colymbus* Linnaeus, 1758, I examine in the following paragraphs the conditions which must be satisfied in order to qualify the action of any given author for recognition as constituting a valid type selection under the *Règles*. This review appears to me essential, not only because in some of the arguments which have been advanced in regard to the type species of the genus *Colymbus* Linnaeus, 1758, those provisions have been misunderstood or even disregarded, but also because prior to 1948 some of the provisions concerned contained serious ambiguities which have now been removed as the result of decisions taken by the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology at its meeting held in Paris in that year. The provisions of which it is necessary to take note are seven in number. Of these provisions the first consists of a qualification directly inserted into Rule (g) in Article 30 at the time (Boston, 1907) when that Article in its present form was inserted in the *Règles*: the second and third follow from interpretations of Rule (g) given by the Commission in *Opinions* rendered by the International Commission prior to 1939, each of which either in its original, or in some clarified, form was incorporated into the *Règles* by the International Congress of Zoology in 1948; the fourth, fifth, sixth and seventh of these provisions all relate to matters on which prior to 1948 the meaning of the *Règles* was in doubt and on which authoritative clarifications were in that year provided by the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology.

### (i) Provisions relating to the selection of the type species of a nominal genus contained in Rule (g) in Article 30 in the form in which that Article existed prior to July 1948

**14.** The expression "select the type species": Rule (g) in Article 30, as that Article stood prior to July 1948, provided that, where the type species

of a given nominal genus had not been determined under any of the preceding Rules in that Article, its type species should be the first of the originally included species to be so selected by a subsequent author. This provision was accompanied by the following interpretation of the meaning to be attached to the expression "select the type" (an expression amended to "select the type species" by the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology—see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 4:300): "The meaning of the expression 'select the type' is to be rigidly construed. Mention of a species as an illustration or example does not constitute a selection of a type."

**(ii) Provisions relating to the selection of the type species of a nominal genus originally promulgated in "Opinions" rendered by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature and in 1948 incorporated into the "Règles" either in their original or in a modified form**

15. The *Opinions* relating to the interpretation of Rule (g) in Article 30 rendered by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature prior to the meeting held in Paris in 1948 which have a bearing upon the present case are *Opinions* 6 and 62. The rulings given in these *Opinions* are discussed in the two immediately following paragraphs.

16. The so-called "Law of Elimination" not recognised in the "Règles" as a mandatory provision: Prior to the international regulation of zoological nomenclature (through the adoption of the present *Règles* by the Fifth International Congress of Zoology at Berlin in 1901) zoologists possessed no authoritative guide as to how they should proceed when they desired to split up a previously established genus, save in those cases where the original author of the generic name concerned had himself specified a type species for the genus so named. For, although the concept of a "type species" in relation to genera was generally accepted, there was no agreement how to apply that concept in relation to nominal genera established without designated type species, for example, nominal genera, other than monotypical genera, established by Linnaeus and other authors of later date. Authors were forced therefore to make a choice for themselves as to how they should proceed in this matter. The result, as was inevitable, was that there was the greatest diversity of practice: some authors applied rules similar to those later embodied in the present Rule (g) in Article 30, under which the species first selected to be the type species of a given species was accepted as such; others accepted as the type species the first of any series of species placed in a given nominal genus by its author (the so-called "chef de file" system); others adopted a system under which it was assumed that, whenever an author on taxonomic grounds removed a species from a given previously established nominal genus by placing it in some other nominal genus, the species so removed ceased to be eligible to become the type species of the genus from which it had been removed; in this way, it was argued, the field from which a type species could be selected was gradually narrowed until finally either only one of the original species was left in the genus and that species automatically became the type species or until some author selected as the type species of the genus one of the originally included



species which had not yet been removed from that genus on taxonomic grounds. This method of determining the type species of a genus was known as the "Law of Elimination." Theoretically, this system possessed advantages over any other system, for, if it could have been applied in a uniform manner, it would have avoided the confusing transfers of generic names from one genus to another which have often resulted from the acceptance as the type species of a genus of the first originally included species to be so selected. Unfortunately, however, insuperable difficulties were often encountered in applying this superficially simple rule owing to differences of opinion among specialists as to what action did or did not constitute the removal of a species from a given genus. The result was that, far from providing the stability which had been hoped for, this so-called "Law" often resulted in the adoption by specialists of totally different views as to the type species of any given genus. This method of determining the type species of a genus had the further weakness that its application was extremely laborious involving the examination of the entire literature of any group before a type-determination could even be attempted and thus placed a premium upon bibliographical investigations as contrasted with zoological investigations. It was for these reasons that, when the present *Règles* were adopted, the "Law of Elimination" was given no place in the mandatory provisions embodied in Article 30. The only concession then granted to this former unofficial "Law" was the insertion in the non-mandatory "Recommendations" at the end of Article 30 of the advice to specialists when selecting the type species of a genus to bear in mind the importance of promoting stability by not selecting as the type species of genera species which on taxonomic grounds are currently treated as having been removed therefrom. Even this "Recommendation" occupies only the fourth place in the list of "Recommendations" there given. Normally, practices in vogue before the adoption of the *Règles* which however failed to secure admittance to the *Règles* are of historical interest only, but in the particular case of the nominal genus *Colymbus* Linnaeus the application of the so-called "Law of Elimination" bulked so largely in the early days—and, indeed, still forms the basis of the argument advanced by one large and important group of workers—that it seems essential in the present Report to make it perfectly clear that in its original form the "Law of Elimination" finds no place in the *Règles*. It should be noted at this point that in one extremely limited application official approval has been given to the principle of "elimination" in a mandatory provision enacted since the adoption of the *Règles* in 1901. This was in 1910, the year in which the Commission's *Opinion* 6 was published (*Smithson. Publ.* 1938:6), for in that *Opinion* the Commission ruled that, where a nominal genus was established with two nominal species but without a designated type species and later one of those nominal species was made the type species of a newly established monotypical genus, it was to be deemed for nomenclatorial purposes to have been removed by elimination from the earlier genus, which was thus left with only one species which accordingly became the type species. In the years following the publication of this *Opinion* it was sometimes argued that the ruling there given need not be regarded as being confined to cases where a species was removed from a genus to a monotypical genus and further that the principle embodied in this *Opinion* was properly applicable also to cases where more than two species were placed in a genus and later authors removed

some of those species, either singly or in groups. This latter argument, if well founded, would have amounted to a full-scale recognition of the Law of Elimination and would greatly have reduced the scope within which Rule (g) in Article 30 would operate and in some cases would have completely superceded that Rule. This matter was considered by the Commission and the Congress at Paris in 1948, and it was then decided to incorporate in the *Règles* the decision originally given in *Opinion* 6, clarified, however, in such a way as to make it absolutely clear that it applied only to the limited class of case originally specified in that *Opinion* (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 4 : 157).

**17. A nominal species which is the type species of one genus eligible for selection as the type species of another genus:** In the preceding paragraph we have considered the position of the so-called "Law of Elimination" in relation to the provisions of the *Règles* as adopted at Berlin in 1901, and have specially noted the one instance in which, through *Opinion* 6, mandatory force was given to the principle embodied in that so-called "Law," which, as explained, had in its main form been rejected by the authors of the present *Règles*. We have here to note a decision taken by the Commission in *Opinion* 62 (published in 1914) (*Smithson Publ.* 2256 : 147-149) rejecting an attempt to secure a further partial acceptance of the principle of elimination. Up to that time it had sometimes been argued that, where a nominal genus had been established with a number of included nominal species but without a designated type species, the species which were eligible for selection by a later author acting under Rule (g) in Article 30 were not all the originally included nominal species but only those species which had not in the meantime become the type species of other genera. This argument, which, it will be observed, relates to one of the situations which (as explained in paragraph 16) some authors had sought to argue could be brought within the scope of the decision taken in *Opinion* 6, was rejected by the Commission which ruled that a species which was the type species of one genus was still eligible for selection as the type species of another genus. This decision was endorsed both by the Commission and the Congress in 1948 and was embodied by the latter in the *Règles* (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 4 : 156).

**(iii) Provisions relating to the selection of the type species of a nominal genus adopted by the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, Paris, 1948**

**18.** At Paris in 1948 the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature obtained the approval of the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology for the insertion in the *Règles* of provisions clarifying the meaning of Rule (g) in Article 30 in four respects. Each of these clarifications has, as will be seen, a bearing on the question of the species to be accepted as the type species of the nominal genus *Colymbus* Linnaeus, 1758. These clarifications are accordingly described briefly in the following paragraphs.

**19. Meaning to be attached to the word "select" as used in the expression "select a type species" as used in Rule (g) in Article 30 :** Reference has already been made (paragraph 14 above) to the supplementary provision in Rule (g) in Article 30 which makes it clear that that Rule is not satisfied if an author merely cites one of the species originally included in a

nominal genus established by some earlier author as being an "illustration" or "example" of that genus and prescribes that the expression "select a type" is to be "rigidly construed." This provision removed what otherwise would have been a serious ambiguity in that Rule, but it left obscure another matter which, as every worker in systematic zoology has occasion to know, constantly arose, whenever it was necessary to determine whether a type species had been validly selected for a given nominal genus. The problem involved was whether an author was to be deemed to have selected the type species of a given nominal genus when, while stating categorically that a given species was the type species, he made it clear also that he regarded himself, not as selecting that species to be the type species, but as doing no more than place on record that that species was the type species as the result of action taken by an earlier author or by earlier authors. The most frequent situation of this kind arises in the case of papers published before the adoption of the *Règles* where an author guiding himself by the so-called "Law of Elimination" (see paragraph 16 above) came to the conclusion that, as the result of the removal of species to other genera, only one species remained eligible for the position of type species of the genus under examination and therefore that species had automatically become the type species "by elimination." The same problem arises also where an author states that a given species is the type species of a genus because it had been so selected by a previous author, when on further examination it is found that no such earlier selection had been made. In view of the very large number of currently accepted type selections which rest upon statements made in papers published before 1901 by authors working under the "Law of Elimination," it was obvious that any ruling which deprived statements of the kind described above of the status of type selections would cause the utmost havoc and confusion. It was obvious also, however, that a definite ruling on this subject was required in order to make it impossible validly to question the acceptability of such type selections. Accordingly, in Paris in 1948 the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, on the recommendation of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, agreed to insert in the *Règles* words making it clear that, "for the purposes of Rule (g) in Article 30, an author is to be treated as having selected a given originally included nominal species to be the type species of a given nominal genus not only when he . . . states that he is so selecting that species but also when he does no more than state that a specified such species is the type species of the nominal genus concerned, irrespective, in the latter case, of whether he states or implies, either correctly or otherwise, that that nominal species had been selected by some previous author to be the type species of that nominal genus, or that the nominal species had become the type species of that genus through the operation of some rule (for example, the so-called "Law of Elimination") not recognised in the *Règles* as a mandatory provision, provided in such a case that the author concerned makes it clear that he himself accepts, for whatever reason, the species in question as the type species of the genus concerned" (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 4: 181-182).

**20. Action taken in regard to a given generic name prior to its first valid publication subsequent to 1757 irrelevant for the purposes of Article 30:** Prior to 1948 it occasionally happened that, notwithstanding



the provision in Article 26 and the associated *Opinion 3* (1910, *Smithson. Publ.* 1938: 6) that for the purposes of the *Règles* zoological nomenclature has, as its starting point, the publication in 1758 of the Tenth Edition of the *Systema Naturae* of Linnaeus, an author would seek to support an argument in relation to some particular name by claiming that some action in regard to that name taken prior to 1758 had some bearing either upon the species to be regarded as the originally included species of the nominal genus so named or as regards the eligibility of such species for selection after 1757 as the type species of the genus in question. In order to dispose of fallacious arguments of this sort, the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, Paris, 1948, on the advice of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, decided to insert in the *Règles* words to make it clear that "Article 30 relates only to the designation, indication, or selection of the type species of a nominal genus published subsequent to 31st December 1757, that is to say to the name of a genus originally published subsequent to the above date by a given author in a given work and that the action then taken by that author is alone relevant to the question, (i) of what species are to be regarded as having been originally included in the genus concerned . . . or (ii) of whether the type species of the genus in question is to be treated as having been designated . . . at the time of the original publication of the generic name concerned" (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 4: 347-348).

**21. A type selection related to any place of publication other than the original place of publication of a generic name invalid under the "Règles":** Another argument occasionally advanced before 1948 in relation to particular cases (of which the name *Colymbus* Linnaeus, 1758, was one) was that, where a given word had been used as a generic name prior to the starting point of zoological nomenclature (as defined in Article 26) as well as at or after that starting point and some later author purported to select a type species for the genus as published before 1758, that action should be regarded as constituting also a selection of a type species for the genus as established after the starting point of zoological nomenclature, i.e. after the close of the year 1757. This argument was considered and rejected in Paris, in 1948, when the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, on the advice of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, agreed to insert in the *Règles* words making it clear that "no selection of the type species of a given nominal genus, which is related to any publication of the name of that genus other than its first valid publication by its author . . . is to be accepted as a selection of the type species of that genus for the purposes of Rule (g) in Article 30" (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 4: 348).

**22. Nominal species eligible for selection as the type species of any given nominal genus:** We have now examined the decisions taken by the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology for the purpose of clarifying the provisions regarding the method to be followed in selecting the type species of a nominal genus under Rule (g) in Article 30. But the obscurities which formerly marred that Rule and made its application uncertain and open to question in many cases were not the only difficulties which up to 1948 had confronted systematists in attempting either to determine what nominal species was the type species of a given nominal genus or what nominal species

were eligible for selection as such. For, although Article 30 contained (in the provision misnamed "Rule (e)") a provision excluding certain nominal species from consideration as possible type species for any given nominal genus, it unfortunately contained no positive provision specifying what nominal species were to be regarded as eligible for selection as type species. In particular, there was nothing in Article 30 to show whether the field of choice for an author selecting a type species was limited to those nominal species recognised as taxonomically valid by the original author of the generic name or whether in addition a nominal species cited by the original author of a generic name in the synonymy of any one of the nominal species placed by him in the genus as representing taxonomically valid species was also eligible for selection as the type genus. Moreover, there was no express provision in Article 30 on the question whether the selection as the type species of a genus of a nominal species not cited by the original author of a generic name should be accepted or rejected in those cases where later authors subjectively identified the nominal species so selected with one of the nominal species actually cited by the original author at the time when the generic name was first validly published. In 1948, however, these obscurities were removed when the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, on the advice of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, decided to insert in the *Règles* words making it clear that "the nominal species to be regarded as having been included in a given nominal genus when the name of that genus was first published are (i) the nominal species cited by the original author as valid taxonomic species belonging to that nominal genus and (ii) any nominal species cited on that occasion as synonyms of nominal species falling in (i) above and that for such a nominal genus the foregoing nominal species were alone eligible for selection as the type species" (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 179-180).

**(b) The field within which alone a valid type-selection for "Colymbus" Linnaeus, 1758, can be made under the "Règles"**

**23. The content of the nominal genus "Colymbus" Linnaeus, 1758, for nomenclatorial purposes :** The name *Colymbus* Linnaeus, 1758 (*Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) **1** : 135) was published for a nominal genus to which at that time Linnaeus referred four nominal species, namely :—(1) *Colymbus arcticus* Linnaeus (: 135); (2) *Colymbus cristatus* Linnaeus (: 135); (3) *Colymbus auritus* Linnaeus (: 135); (4) *Colymbus podiceps* Linnaeus (: 136). Under the clarification of the meaning to be attached to the expression "originally included species" prescribed by the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology in 1948 (see paragraph 22 above), the four nominal species bearing the foregoing specific trivial names are the only nominal species eligible to become the type species of the nominal genus *Colymbus* Linnaeus, 1758.

**(c) The authors who, it has been claimed, either selected a type species for the nominal genus "Colymbus" Linnaeus, 1758, or took action having an equivalent effect**

**24. Latham, 1707:** The first author who, it has been claimed, took action having the effect of determining the type species of the nominal genus *Colymbus*

Linnaeus, 1758, was Latham (1787, *Suppl. gen. Synopsis Birds* [1] : 294). The argument adduced runs as follows :—(1) The genus *Colymbus* as established by Linnaeus in 1758 was heterogeneous from the taxonomic standpoint, containing (a) one palmate-footed species (*pedibus palmatis*), the Northern Diver, *Colymbus arcticus*, and (b) three pinnate-footed species (*pedibus lobatis*), the Grebes *Colymbus cristatus*, *auritus* and *podiceps*. (2) Latham (1787) recognised the impropriety, from the systematic point of view, of including these disparate elements in a single genus and accordingly, as a first reviser, rectified the position (in the tabular statement at the end of his first supplementary volume) by erecting a new genus which he named *Podiceps* (: 294) and to which he assigned the three Grebes which Linnaeus had placed in *Colymbus* (i.e., *C. cristatus*, *auritus* and *podiceps*), together with other Grebes, and which he placed in his “Order VIII. With pinnated feet”; at the same time Latham retained (: 295) the genus *Colymbus* Linnaeus, placing in it the only remaining species (*Colymbus arcticus*) that Linnaeus had placed in his genus *Colymbus*, together with other Divers. This genus Latham placed in his “Order IX Webfooted.” (3) The removal by Latham from the genus *Colymbus* Linnaeus of the three Grebes placed in it by Linnaeus in 1758, by the transfer of those species to his new genus *Podiceps*, left, so it was argued, only one species in the genus *Colymbus* Linnaeus as constituted in 1758, namely the nominal species *Colymbus arcticus* Linnaeus, and in consequence that species, by virtue of Latham’s action, automatically became the type species of *Colymbus* Linnaeus, 1758, under the “Law of Elimination.” This argument, which was originally advanced before the introduction of the present *Règles*, is invalid, since those *Règles* do not recognise a “Law of Elimination” as a mandatory provision for the determination of the type species of genera (paragraphs 16 and 17 above).

**25. Gray (G. R.), 1840 :** In 1840 (*List Genera Birds* : 76) Gray (G. R.) selected *Colymbus glacialis* Linnaeus, 1766 (*Syst. Nat.* (ed. 12) 1(1) : 221) as the type species of the genus *Colymbus* Linnaeus, to which name Gray did not attribute a date. This nominal species was not one of the four such species placed by Linnaeus in the genus *Colymbus* in 1758 (see paragraph 23 above)—and, indeed, could not have been so included, for its name was not published until eight years later. Thus, this nominal species is ineligible to become the type species of the nominal genus *Colymbus* Linnaeus, 1758, and Gray’s action in so selecting it is therefore invalid.

**26. Gray (G. R.), 1841 :** In 1841 (*List Genera Birds* (ed. 2) : 96) Gray again treated *Colymbus glacialis* Linnaeus, 1766, as the type species of *Colymbus* Linnaeus, to which, as in the first edition he attributed no date. This type selection is invalid for the same reasons as is the same selection made by Gray in 1840 (see paragraph 25 above).

**27. Gray (G. R.), 1842 :** In 1842 (*Appendix List Genera Birds* : 15) Gray published a sixteen-page pamphlet in which he added supplementary notes in regard to certain of the generic names included in the second edition of his *List*. Many of these notes consisted in the attribution of dates to generic names previously published without information on this point. In the case of the name *Colymbus* Linnaeus, the entry in the Appendix of 1842 was :—“*Colymbus*, after *L.* add 1735.” From the point of view of nomenclature, this entry would



have been of great importance, if in other respects the type selection for the genus *Colymbus* Linnaeus made in the Second Edition of Gray's *List* had complied with the *Règles* (which, as we have seen—paragraph 26 above—it did not), for the insertion of the date “1735” after the name *Colymbus* L. shows that Gray was dealing not with the Tenth Edition of the *Systema Naturae* of 1758 (the starting point of zoological nomenclature) but with the use of that name by Linnaeus in 1735 in the First Edition of the *Systema Naturae*. Under the *Règles* action taken in respect of a name as published prior to 1758 is totally irrelevant from the point of view of determining the type species of a nominal genus established after the starting point of zoological nomenclature (i.e. a name published in, or after, 1758) (see paragraph 20 above) and the selection of a type species of a genus, if related to any place of publication other than the first place in which that name was validly published, is invalid, having no force under Article 30 (see paragraph 21 above).

**28. Gray (G. R.), 1855** In 1855 there appeared what was, in effect, a third edition of the *List of Genera of Birds*, of which, as we have seen (paragraphs 25 and 26 above) the First and Second Editions were published respectively in 1840 and 1841; it was however published under a slightly different title and it accordingly ranks for bibliographical purposes as a separate work. In this latest work Gray (1) adhered to the dating of the name *Colymbus* Linnaeus adopted in his *Appendix* of 1842, that is, he attributed it to the First Edition of the *Systema Naturae* of 1735 and not to the Tenth Edition of 1758, and (2) made a fresh type selection for the genus *Colymbus* abandoning his earlier selection of *Colymbus glacialis* Linnaeus, 1766, adopting in its place *Colymbus arcticus* Linnaeus, 1758. If Gray's action on this occasion had otherwise been in conformity with the *Règles*, the selection of *C. arcticus* Linnaeus would have been valid, since that nominal species is one of those referred to the genus *Colymbus* by Linnaeus in 1758. But the fact that Gray attributed the name *Colymbus* to a place of publication other than the place where that name was first validly published after the starting point of zoological nomenclature (i.e. other than the Tenth Edition of the *Systema Naturae*) renders his action in 1855 invalid for the reasons explained in paragraphs 20 and 21 above.

**29. Fitzinger, 1865 :** In 1926 (*Ibis* (12)4 : 819) Sclater advanced the view that in 1865 (*SitzBer. Akad. wiss. Wien* (Math-Naturw. Kl.) 51 : 320) Fitzinger had selected *Colymbus arcticus* Linnaeus, 1758, as the type species of the nominal genus *Colymbus* Linnaeus. As however was pointed out by Hellmayr & Conover in 1948 (*Field Mus. Publ. Chicago* (Zool.) 13 (Pt. 1) (No. 2) : 18, footnote), Fitzinger expressly stated in the preface to his paper that what he intended to do was to cite for each of the genera and subgenera concerned one of the typical species. The supplementary provision annexed to Rule (g) in Article 30 lays it down that the citation of a species as an example of a genus does not constitute the selection of that species as the type species of the genus concerned (see paragraph 14 above). Accordingly, Fitzinger's action in 1865 does not constitute a valid selection of *Colymbus arcticus* Linnaeus as the type species of *Colymbus* Linnaeus, 1758.

**30. Baird, Brewer & Ridgway, 1884 :** In 1884 (*Water Birds N. Amer.* 2 : 425) Baird, Brewer & Ridgway, when dealing with the genus *Colymbus*

Linnaeus, 1758, stated that *Colymbus cristatus* Linnaeus, 1758, was the "Type, by elimination." This species is, as we have seen (paragraph 23) one of these originally included by Linnaeus in the genus *Colymbus* in 1758, and, as in 1884 that genus was still without a validly determined type species, it was eligible for selection as such. The only argument which could at any time have been advanced against the acceptance of the action by Baird, Brewer & Ridgway as constituting a type-selection for the genus *Colymbus* Linnaeus, 1758, was that those authors did not look upon themselves as selecting *Colymbus cristatus* Linnaeus as the type species of this genus—indeed, they made it clear that they deplored the necessity of accepting it as such—but on the contrary considered that that species had already become the type species "by elimination." As explained in paragraph 19 above, consideration was given in 1948 both by the Commission and by the International Congress of Zoology to the question whether a definite statement that a given nominal species was the type species of a particular genus constituted a selection of that species as the type species when the author making the statement made it clear that he did not regard himself as so selecting the species in question, considering rather that for one reason or another that species had already become the type species as the result of action taken by earlier authors; it was then decided that such a statement should be accepted as constituting a selection under Rule (g) in Article 30, provided that the author making the statement made it clear that he himself recognised the species in question as the type species of the genus concerned. Baird, Brewer & Ridgway made it perfectly clear that they regarded *Colymbus cristatus* Linnaeus as the type species of *Colymbus* Linnaeus, 1758, and accordingly the possible objection to the acceptance of their action is now seen to be without foundation.

**31. Action by authors subsequent to Baird, Brewer & Ridgway, 1884:** Once a nominal genus has validly acquired a type species under the provisions of Article 30, no action by any later author can change the type species of that genus. In the present case, we have seen (paragraph 30 above) that in 1884 the nominal genus *Colymbus* Linnaeus, 1758, which up to that time was without a type species under the *Règles*, acquired a type species through the selection as such of *Colymbus cristatus* Linnaeus, 1758, by Baird, Brewer & Ridgway. I have therefore considered unnecessary in the present Report to recapitulate the later history of the generic name *Colymbus* Linnaeus, 1758. I have however examined later papers on this subject for the purpose of ascertaining whether any of them contain new evidence relevant to the present subject. I find that they do not. Those authors (e.g. Stejneger) who applied the name *Colymbus* Linnaeus to the Grebes have based themselves on the selection, as the type species of this genus, of *Colymbus cristatus* Linnaeus, 1758, by Baird, Brewer & Ridgway (1884) or upon the later similar selection by the A.O.U. in 1886 (*Check-List N. Amer. Birds*: 73), while those authors who have applied this name to the Divers (Loons) have either (as did Witmer Stone in 1926) accepted Gray's (1855) selection of *Colymbus arcticus* Linnaeus, 1758, or (as did Lonnberg in 1927) have argued in favour of the view that the same species should be accepted as the type species as the result of the action taken in 1787 by Latham, when establishing the nominal genus *Podiceps*.

## III. PRINCIPAL CONCLUSIONS AND FINDING

**32. Principal Conclusions :** Having thus completed the survey of the problem involved in determining what species is, under the *Règles*, the type species of the genus *Colymbus* Linnaeus, 1758, which in Paris in 1948 I was invited to undertake, I now submit as follows the principal conclusions which I have reached :—

- (1) The type species of the nominal genus *Colymbus* Linnaeus, 1758, was neither designated under Rule (a) in Article 30 nor indicated under any of the Rules lettered (b), (c), (d) or (f) in that Article (paragraphs 5-10).
- (2) In view of (1) above, the type species of the foregoing nominal genus falls to be determined under Rule (g) in Article 30 (type species by subsequent selection) (paragraph 11).
- (3) Latham (1787), when establishing the nominal genus *Podiceps* and transferring thereto the three Grebes referred to the genus *Colymbus* by Linnaeus in 1758, thus leaving in the genus *Colymbus* Linnaeus, 1758, only one of the species referred thereto by Linnaeus in 1758, namely the Diver, *Colymbus arcticus* Linnaeus, 1758, did not thereby make that species the type species of *Colymbus* Linnaeus. For Article 30 of the *Règles* does not recognise the so-called "Law of Elimination" and under the *Règles* it was legitimate for any later author to select any of the originally included species to be the type species of *Colymbus* Linnaeus, 1758, notwithstanding the action taken by Latham in 1787 (paragraph 24).
- (4) The selection by Gray in 1840 and again in 1841 of *Colymbus glacialis* Linnaeus, 1766, as the type species of *Colymbus* Linnaeus, 1758, is invalid, because that nominal species was not one of the nominal species referred to the genus *Colymbus* by Linnaeus in 1758 and, indeed, could not have been so referred, as it was not named until eight years later (paragraphs 25 and 26).
- (5) The selection by Gray in 1855 of *Colymbus arcticus* Linnaeus, 1758, as the type species of the genus *Colymbus* is invalid, since that selection related not to the nominal genus *Colymbus* Linnaeus, 1758, but to the pre-1758 nominal genus *Colymbus* Linnaeus, 1735 (paragraph 28).
- (6) Fitzinger (1865) cited *Colymbus arcticus* Linnaeus, 1758, as one of the typical species of the genus *Colymbus* Linnaeus, 1758, but he did not select that species to be the unique type species of that genus. Accordingly, under the provision in Rule (g) in Article 30 that the expression "select the type" is to be "rigidly construed," Fitzinger did not select a type species for *Colymbus* Linnaeus, 1758 (paragraph 29).
- (7) Baird, Brewer & Ridgway in 1884 stated that *Colymbus cristatus* Linnaeus, 1758, was the type species of *Colymbus* Linnaeus, 1758. That nominal species is one of those originally included in the genus *Colymbus* by Linnaeus in 1758, and was therefore eligible for



selection as the type species of that genus. Under Rule (g) in Article 30, as clarified by the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology in 1948, the validity of the action taken by the foregoing authors is not impaired by the fact that they regarded themselves not as selecting the above species to be the type species of *Colymbus* Linnaeus, 1758, but as merely recording (incorrectly) that it was already the type species "by elimination" (paragraph 30).

**33. FINDING.** In discharge of the duty entrusted to me in 1948, jointly by the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology and the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, I have to report that, in the light of the conclusions summarised in the preceding paragraph, my Finding on the question referred to me is as follows :—

**Under the "Règles" the type species of the nominal genus "Colymbus" Linnaeus, 1758, is the nominal species "Colymbus cristatus" Linnaeus, 1758, that nominal species being one of those included by Linnaeus in the nominal genus "Colymbus" in 1758 and being the first such species to be validly selected under Rule (g) in Article 30 to be the type species of this nominal genus, having been so selected by Baird, Brewer & Ridgway in 1884**

(signed) FRANCIS HEMMING.

9th February 1950.

**PROPOSED USE OF THE PLENARY POWERS TO  
SUPPRESS THE TRIVIAL NAME "CASPICUS" HABLIZL,  
1783 (AS PUBLISHED IN THE BINOMINAL COMBINATION  
"COLYMBUS CASPICUS") (CLASS AVES)**

**Application submitted by the  
Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature of the  
International Ornithological Congress**

**(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)525)**

Covering letter, with enclosure, dated 19th October, 1950, from  
Colonel R. Meinertzhagen, Chairman of the Standing Committee on  
Ornithological Nomenclature.

As Chairman of the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature,  
I beg to forward to you the annexed recommendation relating to the name  
*Colymbus caspicus* Hablizl, 1783, for favour of decision by the International  
Commission on Zoological Nomenclature.

The circumstances of the present case were described in a note published  
by Dr. E. Stresemann, a Member of the Standing Committee, in 1948 (Strese-  
mann, 1948, *Ibis* **90** : 473-474), extracts from which are given in the Annexe  
to the application now submitted.

The specific action which the International Commission on Zoological  
Nomenclature is asked to take is that it should : (1) use its plenary powers  
to suppress the trivial name *caspicus* Hablizl, 1783 (as published in the com-  
bination *Colymbus caspicus*) for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not  
for those of the Law of Homonymy ; (2) place the trivial name *nigricollis*  
Brehm, 1831 (as published in the combination *Podiceps nigricollis*) on the  
*Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology* : and (3) place the trivial  
name *caspicus* Hablizl, 1783 (as published in the combination *Colymbus caspicus*)  
as proposed, under (1) above, to be suppressed under the plenary powers,  
on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Trivial Names in Zoology*.

**ENCLOSURE**

**The trivial name comprised in the specific name "Colymbus  
caspicus" Hablizl, 1783, "Neue nordische Beyträge" 4 : 9**

It is recommended that the above name should be made a *nomen rejectum*  
and that the trivial name comprised in the name currently accepted for this  
species, namely *Podiceps nigricollis* Brehm (C.L.), 1831, *Handb. Naturg. Vög.*  
*Deutschl.* : 963 ("Deutschland"), be made a *nomen conservandum*.

The name *Podiceps nigricollis* has been used for the Black-necked Grebe from 1831 to 1948. The circumstances of the present case have been discussed by Stresemann in a note entitled "The earliest description of the Black-necked Grebe" published in 1948 (*Ibis* **90** : 473-474), from which extracts have been made for the information of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature and are submitted in the Annexe to the present application.

R. MEINERTZHAGEN : *Chairman of the Standing Committee.*

E. STRESEMANN : *Zoologisches Museum der Universität, Berlin.*

JOHN T. ZIMMER : *The American Museum of Natural History, New York.*

### ANNEXE TO APPLICATION

#### **Extract from a paper entitled "The earliest description of the Black-necked Grebe" (1948, "Ibis," 90 : 473-474)**

Changes in scientific nomenclature are becoming increasingly unpopular among ornithologists, and rightly so. It is especially awkward if a name of long standing and of very frequent use has to be discarded under present rules in favour of a quite unknown one. I see, however, no way for avoiding supersession of *Podiceps nigricollis* Brehm, 1831, by *Podiceps caspicus* (Hablizl, 1783).

In his article "Bemerkungen in der persischen Landschaft Gilan und auf den Gilanischen Gebirgen in den Jahren 1773 und 1774," published in vol. 4 (1783) of Pallas's magazine "Neue Nordische Beyträge," Carl Hablizl on page 9 gave the following detailed description of a grebe which he had met by the end of November 1773 in the Bay of Enzeli, Caspian Sea, and which he proposed to call *Colymbus caspicus* : "Magnitudo Columbae domesticae, Rostrum plumbeum pollicare, Caput et reliquum corpus supra fusco nigricat. Gula et genae, lateraque colli superioris alba ; collum inferius gryseum. Pectus, abdomen et venter albo-argentea. Alae complicatae ad uropygium protensae. Uropygium infimum albo-nigroque vatiegatum. Remiges a prima ad sectum immaculatae, fuscae, a sexta ad decimum candidae, uno latere fusco maculatae, a decima vero ad vigesimam primam usque immaculatae, candidae. Tectrices alarum fuscae. Pedes et digiti interius cinereo-virescentes, exterius fusconigricantes. Oculorum irides, ut et palpebrae, rubrae."

That this bird was undoubtedly a Black-necked, and not a Slavonian, Grebe (in the synonymy of which the name *Colymbus caspicus* had been sunk by all previous authors, Ogilvie-Grant and Hartert), is proved by the colour of the inner primaries, which are always entirely dark in *P. auritus*, not partially white (candidae, uno latere fusco-maculatae).



**PROPOSED USE OF THE PLENARY POWERS TO  
SUPPRESS FOUR TRIVIAL NAMES FOR BIRDS PUB-  
LISHED BY ANTON AUGUST HEINRICH LICHTENSTEIN  
IN 1793**

**Application submitted by the  
Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature of the  
International Ornithological Congress**

**(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)526)**

Covering letter, with enclosure, dated 19th October, 1950, from Colonel R. Meinertzhagen, Chairman of the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature of the International Ornithological Congress.

As Chairman of the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature, I beg to forward to you the annexed application relating to four trivial names for birds published by A. Lichtenstein in 1793, for favour of decision by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature.

The Standing Committee is unanimous in its view as regards the first and second of the names dealt with in the present application. In the case of the third name (*Cuculus sulphuratus* Lichtenstein (A.), 1793), one member of the Standing Committee (Dr. John T. Zimmer) does not support the proposal submitted.

The problem dealt with in the present application has been discussed by Meise & Stresemann in a paper entitled "Notes on South African birds described in A. Lichtenstein's 'Catalogus,' 1793," published earlier this year in the *Ibis* (Meise & Stresemann, 1950, *Ibis* 92 : 22-26), extracts from which are quoted in the application now submitted.

I have to add that a slight amplification is necessary in the case of the third of the proposals now submitted to the International Commission by the Standing Committee. The object of that proposal is to provide a secure legal foundation for the trivial name *flava* Vieillot, 1817 (as published in the binominal combination *Campephaga flava*), and for this purpose the Standing Committee propose in the annexed application that the International Commission should use its plenary powers for the purpose of suppressing the earlier trivial name *sulphuratus* Lichtenstein, 1793 (as published in the binominal combination *Cuculus sulphuratus*). It must be noted however that, as shown by Meise and Stresemann in their paper published in the *Ibis* in 1950 (extracts from which are incorporated in the application now submitted), Lichtenstein was in doubt as to whether the bird which he was describing was a cuckoo or a shrike. In addition to giving this bird the name *Cuculus sulphuratus*, he therefore gave it also the name *Lanius flavescens*. The application now submitted by the

Standing Committee is therefore to be taken as constituting a request for the suppression, under the plenary powers, of the trivial name *flavescens* Lichtenstein, 1793, as well as of *sulphuratus* Lichtenstein, 1793.

The specific action which the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is now asked to take is thus that it should :—

- (1) use its plenary powers to suppress the under-mentioned trivial names for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy :—
  - (a) *cafra* Lichtenstein, 1793 (as published in the combination *Otis cafra*) ;
  - (b) *cafer* Lichtenstein, 1793 (as published in the combination *Cuculus cafer*) ;
  - (c) *sulphuratus* Lichtenstein, 1793 (as published in the combination *Cuculus sulphuratus*) ;
  - (d) *flavescens* Lichtenstein, 1793 (as published in the combination *Lanius flavescens*) ;
- (2) place the under-mentioned trivial names on the *Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology* ;—
  - (a) *barrowi* Gray (J.E.), 1829 (as published in the combination *Otis barrowi*) ;
  - (b) *clamosus* Latham, 1801 (as published in the combination *Cuculus clamosus*) ;
  - (c) *flava* Vieillot, 1817 (as published in the combination *Campephaga flava*) ;
- (3) place the four trivial names specified in (1) above, as there proposed to be suppressed under the plenary powers, on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Trivial Names in Zoology*.

## ENCLOSURE

**Three trivial names published for birds by Lichtenstein (A.) in 1793 proposed to be suppressed under the plenary powers**

- (1) The trivial name comprised in the specific name *Otis cafra* Lichtenstein (A.), 1793, *Cat. Rer. nat. rarissim.* : 36.

It is recommended that the above name should be made a *nomen rejectum* and that the trivial name comprised in the name currently accepted for this species, namely, *Otis barrowi* Gray (J. E.), 1829, in Griffith's Cuvier's *Animal Kingdom* 8 Aves 3 : 304 ("Cape of Good Hope"), be made a *nomen conservandum*.

- (2) The trivial name comprised in the specific name *Cuculus cafer* Lichtenstein (A.), 1793, *Cat. Reh. nat. rarissim.* : 14.

It is recommended that the above name should be made a *nomen rejectum* and that the trivial name comprised in the name currently accepted for this species, namely *Cuculus clamosus* Latham, 1801, *Index Orn.*, Suppl. 1 : XXX ("Cape of Good Hope"), be made a *nomen conservandum*.

- (3) The trivial name comprised in the specific name *Cuculus sulphuratus* Lichtenstein (A.), 1793, *Cat. Rer. nat. rarissim.* : 15.

It is recommended that the above name should be made a *nomen rejectum* and that the trivial name comprised in the name currently accepted for this species, namely *Campephaga flava* Vieillot, 1817, *Nouv. Dict. Hist. nat.* 10 : 49 ("South Africa"), be made a *nomen conservandum*.

The circumstances of the present case have been discussed by Meise and Stresemann in a paper published in 1950 (*Ibis* 92 : 22-26), from which extracts have been made for the information of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature and are submitted in the Annexe to the present application.

R. MEINERTZHAGEN : *Chairman of the Standing Committee.*

E. STRESEMANN : *Zoologisches Museum der Universität, Berlin.*

JOHN T. ZIMMER\* : *The American Museum of Natural History, New York.*  
(items 1 and 2 only).

---

\*Note by Dr. John T. Zimmer on Case No. 3 (extract from a letter dated 3rd April, 1951) : The case on which I differed from other members of the Standing Committee may be covered by a single statement. I did not feel that any serious confusion would result from the adoption of the newly discovered name. The change is perhaps unfortunate, as all such changes are, but is likely to cause no more than temporary inconvenience.



## ANNEXE TO APPLICATION

**Extract from a paper by Meise & Stresemann published in 1950**  
**("Ibis" 92: 22-26)**

During the last days of October 1793 a large collection of mounted birds . . . was dispersed by auction at Eimbeck's sale house at Hamburg. The contents were made known to the public by a sale catalogue prepared by Dr. Anton August Heinrich Lichtenstein (1753-1816) . . . At the time of this sale, A. A. H. Lichtenstein was headmaster of a famous classical college at Hamburg . . . and his little pamphlet "Catalogus Rerum naturalium rarissimarum," containing the description of several new species, was commented upon in contemporary reviews.

It has long been supposed that many of the specimens listed in the "Catalogus" were collected in South Africa by Francois Levaillant during his stay from 1781-1784, yet Godman had to confess that he was quite at a loss regarding the former owner of this remarkable Cabinet. It is only now that the mystery of more than 150 years can be unveiled. All these valuable mammals, birds, shells, and insects had formed the Cabinet of L. F. Holthuizen, a wealthy Dutchman living at Amsterdam, whose collection had been praised by Levaillant ("Oiseaux d'Afrique, I," 1796, 4to, p. 56) in the following terms: "à Amsterdam, on voit encore le cabinet très-nombreux d'oiseaux, du citoyen Holthuyzen, qui possède aussi une grande et belle suite de papillons et d'insectes."

A remark of the younger Lichtenstein, contained in the biography of his father . . . where it is expressly stated that the latter catalogued the Holthuizen collection, led to the final solution of the riddle . . . It has been this accidental discovery that induced us to study the catalogue with critical eyes, whereby it soon became apparent that this had only very seldom been done by others.

Holthuizen seems to have bought his specimens from many sources; . . . A good many (47 species) came from Cayenne, but no other part of the world had contributed to it as much as South Africa: 60 species. It can hardly be doubted that most, if not all, of them had been collected there by Levaillant . . . Levaillant must have sold these birds to Holthuizen during the years 1785 to 1790—at the same time that another part of his collection went to Jacob Temminck and Joan Raye van Breukelerwaard, both equally of Amsterdam.

A. Lichtenstein had but very little practice in determining birds, yet the number of new species he dared to describe . . . amounted to 38, 17 of which are stated to have come from South Africa. They are the following:—

. . . . .

5. *Otis cafra* nobis (p. 36). "Caffernland." Owing to the misinterpretation of A. Lichtenstein's original description (1793) by H. Lichtenstein in 1823, the name *Otis cafra* has been accepted to designate the large "Veld Paauw" of the Boers. However from examination of the 1793 "Catalogus" it becomes apparent that a small species of Bustard was meant, and that the description exactly fits the species named *Otis barrowi* by Gray (though most inappropriately, since John Barrow's "Wild

Peacock" was the large species hitherto called *Otis cafra*). Unless A. Lichtenstein's *Otis cafra* is voted an obligatory synonym of the later *Otis* . . . , our discovery is going to have deplorable consequences. . . .

. . . . .

8. *Cuculus cafer* nobis (p. 14), "terra Cafrirum." This name was forgotten up to 1870, when Sharpe ("Ibis," 1870:58) applied it to the species up to then incorrectly named *Coccytes* afer (Leach). Sharpe apparently never gave the reasons for his change in nomenclature, which soon was adopted by all ornithologists, although the original description at a glance reveals the error. In reality Lichtenstein had before him a bird which was not crested and "corpore supra splendide atro, infra fusco undulato. Remiges et retrices splendide nigrae maculatis exalbidis . . . Kopf, Nacken und Rücken sind glänzend schwarz; Brust und Unterleib sind braun gewellet. . . ." Such barred specimens of *Cuculus clamosus* occur in South Africa (Stark & Selater, "Birds South Africa," 3 (1903): 192). Therefore the synonymy will be:—

*Cuculus cafer* A. Lichtenstein

*Cuculus cafer* A. Lichtenstein, "Cat. Rer. nat." 1793: 14

*Cuculus clamosus* Latham, "Ind. Orn." Suppl. 1 (1801): xxx

*Clamator levaillanti* (Swainson)

*Cuculus afer* Leach, "Zool. Misc." 1 (1814): 72, tab. 31 nec *Cuculus cafer* Gmelin, "Syst. Nat." 1: 418, 1788 (which is *Leptosomus discolor* (Hermann 1783))

*Coccyzus levaillanti* Swainson, "Zool. Ill." (2) 1: 3, 1829, tab. 13

*Cuculus cafer* Sharpe 1870 et auct. seq., but not of A. Lichtenstein.

9. " ? *Cuculus sulphuratus* nobis; vel potius *Lanius flavescens* ? " (p. 15). "Hab. in terra Caffrorum." A. Lichtenstein had been in doubt whether this Cuckoo-shrike was really a cuckoo or rather a yellowish shrike. His description is clearly that of the female of *Campephaga flava* Vieillot. This implies the following change (unless the current name is ranked among the *nomina conservanda* by some international body).

*Campephaga sulphurata* (A. Lichtenstein)

*Cuculus sulphuratus* A. Lichtenstein 1793 ("terra Cafrorum," descr. ♀).

*Campephaga flava* Vieillot 1817 (South Africa, ex Levaillant, descr. ♀).

*Campephaga nigra* Vieillot 1817 (South Africa, ex Levaillant, descr. ♂).

. . . . .

### Suggestions

In accordance with their postulate that changes in current nomenclature ought to be avoided as far as possible, the authors suggest :—

1. Discarding altogether those names which had been misinterpreted for a century, instead of connecting them in future with their original, and therefore proper, species. If one applies this to the names *Otis cafra* (A. Lichtenstein) and *Cuculus cafer* (A. Lichtenstein), changes in the nomenclature of the genera *Eupodotis* and *Cuculus* will be prevented.

2. Ranking *Campephaga flava* Vieillot among the *nomina conservanda*, with *Cuculus sulphuratus* (A. Lichtenstein) an obligatory synonym of it.



**PROPOSED USE OF THE PLENARY POWERS TO SUPPRESS THE TRIVIAL NAME "NORTONIENSIS" GMELIN, 1789 (AS PUBLISHED IN THE BINOMINAL COMBINATION "FRINGILLA NORTONIENSIS" (CLASS AVES))**

**Application submitted by the  
Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature of the  
International Ornithological Congress**

**(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)527)**

Covering letter, with enclosure, dated 19th October, 1950, from Colonel R. Meinertzhagen, Chairman of the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature

As Chairman of the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature, I beg to forward to you the annexed recommendation relating to the name *Fringilla nortoniensis* Gmelin, 1789, for favour of decision by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature.

The circumstances of the present case were described by Dr. E. Stresemann, a Member of the Standing Committee, in a paper entitled "Birds collected in the North Pacific Area during Capt. James Cook's last Voyage (1778 and 1779)," published in 1949 (Stresemann, 1949, *Ibis* **91** : 252), an extract from which is given in the Annexe to the application now submitted.

The specific action which the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is asked to take in this case is : (1) that it should use its plenary powers to suppress the trivial name *nortoniensis* Gmelin, 1789 (as published in the combination *Fringilla nortoniensis*) for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy ; (2) place the trivial name *pyrrhulinus* Swinhoe, 1876 (as published in the combination *Emberiza pyrrhulinus*) on the *Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology*, and (3) place the trivial name *nortoniensis* Gmelin, 1789 (as published in the combination *Fringilla nortoniensis*), as proposed, in (1) above, to be suppressed under the plenary powers, on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Trivial Names in Zoology*.

**ENCLOSURE**

**The trivial name comprised in the specific name "Fringilla nortoniensis" Gmelin, 1789**

It is recommended that the trivial name (*nortoniensis*) comprised in the specific name *Fringilla nortoniensis* Gmelin, 1789 (in Linnaeus, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 13) **1**(2) : 922) be made a *nomen rejectum* and that the trivial name (*pyrrhulina*) comprised in the name currently accepted for this species, namely

*Emberiza pyrrhulinus* Swinhoe, 1876, *Ibis* (3) 5 : 333, pl. VIII, fig. 2 ("Hakodati") be made a *nomen conservandum*.

The trivial name *pyrrhulinus* Swinhoe, 1876, has been in continuous use for three quarters of a century, while the name *nortoniensis* Gmelin, 1789, has been completely overlooked. The introduction of Gmelin's long-forgotten name *nortoniensis* would give rise to confusion and would be open to strong objection.

Attached to the present application is an extract from a paper by Dr. E. Stresemann published in 1949 (*Ibis* 91 : 252) in which the trivial name *nortoniensis* Gmelin was first synonymised with *pyrrhulinus* Swinhoe.

R. MEINERTZHAGEN : *Chairman of the Standing Committee.*

E. STRESEMANN : *Zoologisches Museum der Universität, Berlin.*

JOHN T. ZIMMER : *The American Museum of Natural History, New York.*

## ANNEXE TO APPLICATION

### **Extract from a paper entitled "Birds collected in the North Pacific Area during Capt. James Cook's last Voyage (1778 and 1779)" (Stresemann, 1949, "Ibis" 91 : 244-255)**

[The birds discussed in the above paper are grouped by reference to the localities in which they were observed, and the dates on which these localities were visited on Captain Cook's voyage. The bird dealt with in the present application is discussed in the tenth of these groups which is lettered "J." and is concerned with birds observed in Kamschatka.]

J. KAMTSCHATKA : 28th April to 4th June, 1779 and 24th August to 9th October, 1779.

- (1) [*Emberiza schoeniclus pyrrhulinus* Swinhoe, 1876] *Fringilla nortoniensis* Gmelin, 1(2) : 922 (1789), ex "Norton Finch," Pennant, 2 : 376. "Discovered in Norton Sound." Locality wrong. The specimen described by Pennant is a male in fresh autumn plumage (lacking the outermost pair of tail feathers) of the Kamschatka race of the Reed Bunting.

**PROPOSED USE OF THE PLENARY POWERS TO SUPPRESS SEVEN TRIVIAL NAMES PUBLISHED BY GMELIN IN 1788 AND 1789 FOR BIRDS WHICH UNTIL 1950 REMAINED UNIDENTIFIED**

**Application submitted by the  
Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature of the  
International Ornithological Congress**

**(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)454)**

Covering letter, dated 19th October, 1950, with enclosure, from Colonel R. Meinertzhagen, Chairman of the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature of the International Ornithological Congress

As Chairman of the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature, I beg to forward to you the following recommendations for favour of decision by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature.

The recommendations now submitted relate to seven trivial names published by Gmelin in 1789 for birds taken on Captain Cook's Last Expedition. None of these names has been used by ornithologists, for the species so named have always been considered unrecognizable until in 1950 Dr. Erwin Stresemann, a member of the Standing Committee, established the identity of the species in question (Stresemann, 1950, *Auk* **67** : 66-88). In the opinion of the majority of the members of the Committee it is desirable that all the seven names listed in the enclosure to the present letter should be suppressed by the International Commission, the corresponding names now in use for the species concerned being at the same time placed on the *Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology*. One member of the Standing Committee (Dr. John T. Zimmer), while concurring with the other members of the Committee as regards five of the seven names concerned, does not support the recommendation submitted in the two other names, namely the trivial name *eimeensis* Gmelin, 1789 (as published in the binominal combination *Columba eimeensis*) and the trivial name *australis* Gmelin, 1789 (as published in the binominal combination *Sterna australis*).



The action which the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is asked to take is that it should :—

- (1) use its plenary powers to suppress the under-mentioned trivial names for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy :—

- (a) *eimeensis* Gmelin, 1789 (as published in the combination *Columba eimeensis*) ;
- (b) *unalaschkensis* Gmelin, 1789 (as published in the combination *Hirundo unalaschkensis*) ;
- (c) *natka* Gmelin, 1788 (as published in the combination *Lanius natka*) ;
- (d) *septentrionalis* Gmelin, 1788 (as published in the combination *Lanius septentrionalis*) ;
- (e) *borealis* Gmelin, 1789 (as published in the combination *Motacilla borealis*) ;
- (f) *cirrhatu*s Gmelin, 1789 (as published in the combination *Pelecanus cirrhatu*s) ;
- (g) *australis* Gmelin, 1789 (as published in the combination *Sterna australis*) ;

- (2) place the under-mentioned trivial names on the *Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology* :—

- (a) *stairi* Gray (G.R.), 1856 (as published in the combination *Caloenas (Phlegoenas) stairi*) ;
- (b) *townsendi* Oberholser, 1906 (as published in the combination *Collocala francica townsendi*) ;
- (c) *pacificus* Gmelin, 1789 (as published in the combination *Turdus pacificus*) ;
- (d) *heinei* Finsch & Hartlaub, 1870 (as published in the combination *Myiolestes heinei*) ;
- (e) *sepium* Horsfield, 1821 (as published in the combination *Orthotomus sepium*) ;
- (f) *albiventer* Lesson, 1831 (as published in the combination *Carbo albiventer*) ;
- (g) *cerulea* Bennett (F.D.), 1840 (as published in the combination *Sterna cerulea*) ;

- (3) place on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Trivial Names in Zoology* the seven trivial names specified in (1), as there proposed to be suppressed under the plenary powers.

## ENCLOSURE

**Seven trivial names published for birds by Gmelin in 1789  
proposed to be suppressed under the plenary powers**

1. The trivial name comprised in the specific name *Columba eimeensis* Gmelin, 1789, in Linnaeus, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 13) **1** (2) : 784.

It is recommended that the above name should be made a *nomen rejectum* and that the trivial name comprised in the name currently accepted for this species, namely *Caloenas (Phlegoenas) stairi* Gray (G. R.), [1856], *Proc. zool. Soc. Lond.* **24** (301) : 7 ("Samoa") be made a *nomen conservandum*. See Stresemann, 1950, *Auk* **67** : 75.

2. The trivial name comprised in the specific name *Hirundo unalaschkensis* Gmelin, 1789, in Linnaeus, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 13) **1** (2) : 1025.

It is recommended that the above name should be made a *nomen rejectum* and that the subspecific trivial name comprised in the name currently accepted for this subspecies, namely *Collocalia francica townsendi* Oberholser, 1906, *Proc. Acad. nat. Sci. Philad.* **58** : 181 ("Tonga Islands") be made a *nomen conservandum*. See Stresemann, 1950, *Auk* **67** : 74.

3. The trivial name comprised in the specific name *Lanius natka* Gmelin, 1788, in Linnaeus, *ibid.* **1** (1) : 309.

It is recommended that the above name should be made a *nomen rejectum* and that the trivial name comprised in the name currently accepted for this species, namely *Turdus pacificus* Gmelin, 1789, in Linnaeus, *ibid.* **1** (2) : 813, be made a *nomen conservandum*. See Stresemann, 1950, *Auk* **67** : 73.

4. The trivial name comprised in the specific name *Lanius septentrionalis* Gmelin, 1788, in Linnaeus, *ibid.* **1** (1) : 306.

It is recommended that the above name should be made a *nomen rejectum* and that the trivial name comprised in the name currently accepted for this species, namely *Myiolestes heinei* Finsch & Hartlaub, 1870, *Proc. zool. Soc. Lond.* **1869** : 546 ("Tonga Islands"), be made a *nomen conservandum*. See Stresemann, 1950, *Auk* **67** : 73-74.

5. The trivial names comprised in the specific names *Motacilla borealis* Gmelin, 1789, in Linnaeus, *ibid.* **1** (2) : 986, and *Motacilla camtschatkensis* Gmelin, 1789, in Linnaeus, *ibid.* **1** (2) : 986.

It is recommended that the above names (which apply to the same species) should be made *nomina rejecta* and that the trivial name comprised in the name currently accepted for this species, namely *Orthotomus sepium* Horsfield, 1821, *Trans. linn. Soc. Lond.* **13** (1) : 166 ("Java") be made a *nomen conservandum*. See Stresemann, 1950, *Auk* **67** : 81-82.

6. The trivial name comprised in the specific name *Pelecanus cirrhatus* Gmelin, 1789, in Linnaeus, *ibid.* **1** (2) : 576.

It is recommended that the above name should be made a *nomen rejectum* and that the trivial name comprised in the trivial name comprised in the name currently accepted for this species, namely *Carbo albiventer* Lesson, 1831, *Traité Orn.* (8) : 604 ("Falkland Islands"), be made a *nomen conservandum*. See Strösemann, 1950, *Auk* **67** : 83.

7. The trivial name comprised in the specific name *Sterna australis* Gmelin, 1789, in Linnaeus, *ibid.* **1** (2) : 608.

It is recommended that the above name should be made a *nomen rejectum* and that the trivial name comprised in the name currently accepted for this species, namely *Sterna cerulea* Bennett (F. D.), 1840, *Narr. Whaling Voy.* **2** : 248 ("Christmas Island") be made a *nomen conservandum*. See Strösemann, 1950, *Auk* **67** : 78.

R. MEINERTZHAGEN : *Chairman of the Standing Committee.*

E. STRESEMANN : *Zoologisches Museum der Universität, Berlin.*

JOHN T. ZIMMER\* : *The American Museum of Natural History, New York.*  
(except items 1 and 7)

---

\*Note by Dr. John T. Zimmer on Cases Nos. 1 and 7 (extract from a letter dated 3rd April, 1951): The cases on which I differed from other members of the Standing Committee may be covered by a single statement. I did not feel that any serious confusion would result from the adoption of the newly discovered name. The change is perhaps unfortunate, as all such changes are, but is likely to cause no more than temporary inconvenience.



**PROPOSED USE OF THE PLENARY POWERS TO VALIDATE THE TRIVIAL NAME "ELEGANS" GOULD, 1837 (AS PUBLISHED IN THE BINOMINAL COMBINATION "MALURUS ELEGANS") (CLASS AVES)**

By H. M. WHITTELL, O.B.E.

(On behalf of the Checklist Committee of the Royal Australasian Ornithologists' Union.)

**(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)341)**

The Checklist Committee of the Royal Australasian Ornithologists' Union petitions the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to use its plenary powers to suppress the trivial name *elegans* Forster (J.R.), 1794, *Mag. merkwürd. neuen Reise Beschr.* 5 : 128 (as published in the binominal combination *Motacilla elegans*) and thereby to validate the trivial name *elegans* Gould (J.), 1837, *Birds Australia and adj. Islands* (1) : pl. 2 (as published in the binominal combination *Malurus elegans*), on the ground that the strict application of the *Règles* in this case would lead to confusion rather than stability.

2. In 1837, John Gould introduced the name *Malurus elegans* for a Western Australian bird, for which this name has been in use ever since—for a period of over 110 years.

3. In 1937, however, Mr. T. Iredale pointed out (*The Emu* 37 : 95-99) that in 1794 J. R. Forster, in his *Magazin von merkwürdigen neuen Reise Beschreibungen* applied the name *Motacilla elegans* to a different bird, namely that to which in 1783 (*Gen. syn. Birds* 2(2) : 581) Latham had applied the name *Motacilla cyanea*.

4. The two birds discussed above are currently regarded as belonging to the same genus, and in consequence the name *elegans* Gould, 1837, is invalid, being a junior secondary homonym of the name *elegans* Forster, 1794. The strict applications of the *Règles* in the present case would cause great confusion, for it would not only mean that the Western Australian bird would be deprived of the name by which it has been universally known since 1837 but would also involve the transfer of the name *elegans* to another species in the same genus. This would be a very high price to pay for the sake of bringing into use the name *elegans* Forster, 1794, which has never had any currency, virtually the only reference to it in the literature being in the account given in Iredale in 1937.

5. It is for the foregoing reasons that the International Commission is asked to take the action specified in the first paragraph of the present Commission. The Commission is asked at the same time (1) to place the trivial name *elegans* Gould, 1837 (as published in the binominal combination *Malurus elegans*) on the *Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology*, and (2) to place the trivial name *elegans* Forster, 1794 (as published in the binominal combination *Motacilla elegans*) on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Trivial Names in Zoology*.

*Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, Vol. 9 (October 1952)

**PROPOSED USE OF THE PLENARY POWERS TO SUPPRESS  
FOR NOMENCLATORIAL PURPOSES A PAPER BY FOR-  
STER (J. R.) CONTAINING NEW NAMES FOR CERTAIN  
AUSTRALIAN BIRDS PUBLISHED IN 1794 IN VOLUME 5  
OF THE "MAGAZIN VON MERKWÜRDIGEN NEUEN REISE  
BESCHREIBUNGEN"**

By ERNST MAYR (*The American Museum of Natural History, New York*),  
DEAN AMADON (*The American Museum of Natural History, New York*),  
JEAN DELACOUR (*The American Museum of Natural History, New York*),  
L. GLAVERT (*Natural History Museum, Perth, Western Australia*),  
ROBERT CUSHMAN MURPHY (*The American Museum of Natural History,  
New York*),

D. L. SERVENTY (*Nedlands, Western Australia*),  
H. M. WHITTELL, O.B.E. (*Bridgetown, Western Australia*)

**(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)494)**

(Communicated on 19th October, 1950, by Colonel R. Meinertzhagen,  
Chairman of the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature  
of the International Ornithological Congress)

The occasional discovery of long-forgotten scientific names has been exceedingly unsettling for scientific nomenclature. To correct this evil, the International Zoological Congress at Monaco adopted in 1913 the so-called Monaco Resolution which permits the setting aside of the Rule of Priority whenever its application results clearly in greater confusion than uniformity. Even though this opportunity to save well-established names has been available since 1913, ornithologists have only rarely taken advantage of it. The International Ornithological Congress at Uppsala, 1950, appointed a committee of bird taxonomists to collaborate with the International Commission of Zoological Nomenclature and, in particular, to call attention to names which are in need of preservation in accordance with the Monaco Resolution.

2. The names of some Australian birds seem to require action under the Monaco Resolution. In 1937 (*Emu* **37** : 95-99) Tom Iredale called attention to an overlooked paper by J. R. Forster published in 1794 in German as an appendix to a description of the new British colonies in Australia (*Magazin von merkwürdigen neuen Reise Beschreibungen* **5** : 128). This publication contains fifteen new scientific names which were analysed by Iredale who found that only four have priority over names now in use. Furthermore, one of them, namely *Alcedo collaris* Forster, 1794, is a homonym of *Alcedo collaris* Scopoli, 1786 (*Deliciae Florae Faunae insubricae* **2** : 90) and was therefore stillborn at the time of its publication.

3. Iredale analysed in detail the status of the other three names with the following results :—

(1) *Turdus phaeus* Forster, 1794, has seven years' priority over *Turdus harmonicus* Latham, 1801 (*Index Orn.*, Suppl. : xii), the well-known name of the Grey Shrikethrush called *Colluricincla harmonica* for over 130 years. To replace this well-established name at the present time would clearly be most unfortunate, and we request therefore the International Commission to make use of its plenary powers to place the name *Turdus harmonicus* Latham, 1801, on the list of *nomina conservanda* and the name *Turdus phaeus* Forster, 1794, on the list of *nomina rejecta*.

(2) Action in the second case is even more important. Forster gives the name *Motacilla elegans* to the bird now called *Malurus cyaneus australis* North, 1904. If Forster's name is accepted this bird would receive the name *Malurus cyaneus elegans* Forster. However, Gould proposed the name *Malurus elegans* in 1837 for a Western Australian bird for which it has been in use for more than 100 years. A transfer of the name *elegans* from the Western Australian species to the eastern one would cause severe confusion. We request therefore the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to make use of its plenary powers and place *Malurus elegans* Gould, 1837 (*Birds Austr.* (1) : pl. 2) on the list of *nomina conservanda* and *Motacilla elegans* Forster, 1794, on the list of *nomina rejecta*.

(3) The third name is *Muscicapa chlorotis* Forster, 1794, for a bird generally called *Muscicapa* [= *Meliphaga*] *chrysops* (Latham, 1801) (= *Sylvia chrysops* Latham, 1801, *Index Ornith.*, Suppl. : liv), but which Iredale states to be antedated by *Muscicapa novaehollandiae* Latham, 1790 (*Index Orn.* : 478).

**4. Recommendation ;** The publication in which Forster proposes these names is apparently exceedingly rare. It does not appear to be in the library of the British Museum (Natural History), and these scientific names are not included in Sherborn's *Index Animalium*. The simplest way to deal with this publication would be to classify all the names published in this volume as *nomina rejecta*. The ornithologists whose names appear at the head of this application suggest this action to the International Commission.



ON THE QUESTION WHETHER IT IS NECESSARY THAT  
THE PLENARY POWERS SHOULD BE USED TO SUPPRESS  
THE TRIVIAL NAME "NOVAEHOLLANDIAE" LATHAM,  
1790 (AS PUBLISHED IN THE COMBINATION "MUSCI-  
CAPA NOVAEHOLLANDIAE") IN ORDER TO MAKE  
AVAILABLE THE TRIVIAL NAME "CHRYSOPS" LATHAM,  
1801 (AS PUBLISHED IN THE COMBINATION "SYLVIA  
CHRYSOPS") (CLASS AVES)

By FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E.

(Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)494)

1. When I received the application submitted to the International Commission for the use of the plenary powers to suppress three trivial names published for Australian birds by Forster (J. R.) in 1794, it seemed to me that further clarification was needed as regards the third of the cases submitted, for it was not clear that the action recommended would be sufficient to secure the purpose of the applicants, namely to ensure that the trivial name *chrysops* Latham, 1801 (as published in the binominal combination *Sylvia chrysops*) should be the oldest trivial name available (both objectively and subjectively) for the bird to which it is currently applied. For the applicants pointed out that the nominal species *Sylvia chrysops* Latham, 1801, had been subjectively identified by Iredale not only with the nominal species *Muscicapa chlorotis* Forster, 1794, but also with the older nominal species *Muscicapa novaehollandiae* Latham, 1790. The suppression (as proposed) of the trivial name *chlorotis* Forster, 1794, would, therefore, not suffice to provide availability for the trivial name *chrysops* Latham, 1801.

2. With the approval of Colonel R. Meinertzhagen (through whom this application had been submitted to the Commission), I accordingly decided to raise this question with Dr. Ernst Mayr (American Museum of Natural History, New York), the first of the signatories to the application submitted to the International Commission. When my letter reached New York, Dr. Mayr had left on a visit to Europe. On receiving my letter, he answered direct from Europe and at the same time sent my letter back to Dr. Dean Amadon at the American Museum. A little later Dr. Amadon wrote me a letter quoting the views expressed on this subject by Dr. D. L. Serventy (Nedlands, Western Australia) in a letter to Dr. Mayr and at the same time adding a note of his own views on the question at issue. The views of these specialists are set out in the following paragraphs.

3. View of Dr. Ernst Mayr (letter dated 7th April, 1951): Dr. Mayr wrote:—

What a pity your letter did not reach me before I left New York. . . . Most authors considered *novahollandiae* Latham, 1790, up to now as unidentifiable (a *nomen dubium*) and there are indeed some outright contradictions in the description, if the name really applies to *chrysops*. However Serventy wrote me recently that the name was based on some paintings and that these paintings represent *chrysops* undoubtedly. You are therefore entirely correct that it would be wiser to outlaw also the name *novae-hollandiae*. This is indeed what Serventy proposed to me by letter. You have my full authority to act along the line of your suggestion.

4. View of Dr. D. L. Serventy, expressed in a letter to Dr. Ernst Mayr (communicated by Dr. Dean Amadon in a letter dated 11th April, 1951): In a letter, dated 11th April, 1951, Dr. Dean Amadon quoted the following passage from a letter previously received by Dr. Ernst Mayr from Dr. D. L. Serventy:—

Your paragraph on the name *Muscicapa novaehollandiae* is strictly logical if one can confine oneself to the written word. Unfortunately, the name is based also on the coloured plate and a textual description in a work by John White "Journal of a Voyage to New South Wales," an extract from which I enclose.

You will see that certain portions of White's original description are omitted by Latham. The plate, which is in colour, is not a very good one but I think it can be accepted to represent the bird we now know as *Meliphaga chrysops*. In the plate the bill is shown as being down-curved and is black at the base and tip. The most striking discrepancy between the plate and the actual bird is the absence of the black lines at the side of the head but this may have been due to the fact that the head on the plate is very dark except for the yellow ear coverts.

My copy of White was bought some years ago from Tom Iredale who told me that it was one of the original copies owned by Mathews. There are several annotations in pencil by Mathews in it and the plate of the Yellow-eared Flycatcher is labelled in Mathews's hand-writing as *M. ornata*. This is the view which Mathews also held in his "Birds of Australia," vol. 2, but in the 1931 list he used *novae-hollandiae* as the prior name for *M. chrysops*.

It is quite impossible that the bird figured by White might have been *M. ornata* which is an inland bird in New South Wales. The only two possibilities are *M. fusca* or *M. chrysops*, and the bird represented to me appears to be the latter.

I think that the only thing to do now is to endeavour to place the name *Muscicapa novaehollandiae* on the list of *nomina rejecta*.

5. Comment by Dr. Dean Amadon (letter dated 11th April, 1951): In the letter containing the foregoing extract from the letter from Dr. Serventy quoted in the preceding paragraph, Dr. Amadon added the following comment:

You will see from this that Serventy believes that this name *Muscicapa*

*novae-hollandiae* Latham, 1790, applies to the bird now known as *Meliphaga chrysops* and thinks that the name *novae-hollandiae*, as well as *chlorotis*, should be declared *nomina rejecta*. It may be emphasised that there is some doubt still as to whether the name *novae-hollandiae* actually does refer to the species in question.

**6. Conclusion :** It is evident from the foregoing statements that, although there is still room for difference of opinion regarding the identity of the species represented by the name *Muscicapa novae-hollandiae* Latham, 1790, the likelihood of the species in question being the same as that represented by the nominal species *Sylvia chrysops* Latham, 1801, is so great that, so long as the first of these names remains available nomenclatorially, it will never be possible to secure the object sought by the applicants, namely that the trivial name *chrysops* Latham shall be unquestionably the oldest available trivial name for the bird now known as *Meliphaga chrysops* (Latham, 1801).



**SUPPORT BY THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON ORNITHOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE OF THE INTERNATIONAL ORNITHOLOGICAL CONGRESS FOR THE PROPOSALS SUBMITTED BY DR. ERNST MAYR AND OTHERS FOR THE USE OF THE PLENARY POWERS TO SUPPRESS FOR NOMENCLATORIAL PURPOSES A PAPER CONTAINING NEW NAMES FOR CERTAIN AUSTRALIAN BIRDS PUBLISHED BY FORSTER IN 1794**

**Communication received from the  
Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature of the  
International Ornithological Congress**

**(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)494)**

Letter dated 4th April 1952 from Colonel R. Meinertzhagen,  
Chairman of the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature  
of the International Ornithological Congress

On 19th October 1950 I forwarded to you, for favour of decision by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, an application which had been sent to me, as Chairman of the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature, by Dr. Ernst Mayr and others, asking the International Commission to use its plenary powers for the purpose of suppressing, for nomenclatorial purposes, a paper containing new names by J. R. Forster for certain Australian birds published in 1794 in volume 5 of the *Magazin von merkwürdigen neuen Reise Beschreibungen*.

I have now to inform you that the proposals drawn up by Dr. Mayr have since been examined by the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature, each member of which has signed the attached copy of Dr. Mayr's application. In the name of the Standing Committee (Professor Berlioz, Dr. Stresemann, Dr. Zimmer and myself) I accordingly beg to ask you to inform the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature that the foregoing application has the full support of the Standing Committee.

In the case of the third of the names dealt with in the foregoing application, the International Commission is asked to treat the application as one for the suppression not only of the trivial name *chlorotis* Forster, 1794 (as published in the binominal combination *Muscicapa chlorotis*) but also of the trivial name *novaeollandiae* Latham, 1790 (as published in the binominal combination *Muscicapa novaeollandiae*), since, as explained in the application, the identification by Iredale of Latham's *novaeollandiae* constitutes just as much a threat to the name (*chrysops*) commonly applied to this species as does Forster's name *chlorotis*.

The action which the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is asked to take is that it should :—

(1) use its plenary powers to suppress :—

(a) the trivial name *elegans* Forster, 1794 (as published in the combination *Motacilla elegans*) for the purposes both of the Law of Priority and of the Law of Homonymy ;

(b) the under-mentioned trivial names for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy :—

(i) *phaeus* Forster, 1794 (as published in the combination *Turdus phaeus*) ;

(ii) *chlorotis* Forster, 1794 (as published in the combination *Muscicapa chlorotis*) ;

(iii) *novaeollandiae* Latham, 1790 (as published in the combination *Muscicapa novaeollandiae*) ;

(2) place the under-mentioned trivial names on the *Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology* :—

(a) *harmonicus* Latham, 1801 (as published in the combination *Turdus harmonicus*) ;

(b) *elegans* Gould, 1837 (as published in the combination *Malurus elegans*) ;

(c) *chrysops* Latham, 1801 (as published in the combination *Sylvia chrysops*) ;

(3) place on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Trivial Names in Zoology* the four trivial names specified in (1) above, as there proposed to be suppressed under the plenary powers.

**PROPOSED EMENDATION, UNDER ARTICLE 19, OF THE TRIVIAL NAMES OF THREE SPECIES OF BIRD WHICH, WHEN FIRST PUBLISHED, WERE INCORRECTLY SPELT**

**Application submitted by the  
Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature of the  
International Ornithological Congress**

**(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)491)**

Covering letter dated 19th October, 1950, with enclosure, from Colonel R. Meinertzhagen, Chairman of the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature of the International Ornithological Congress

As Chairman of the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature, I beg to forward to you the following recommendation relating to the acceptance of emendations of the trivial names of three bird species for favour of decision by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature.

Each of the trivial names concerned is the oldest available for the species concerned, and it is accordingly recommended that these three names, when emended, should be placed on the *Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology*.

**ENCLOSURE**

**Proposed correction of faulty orthography in the case of the trivial names of three species of bird**

*Alauda brachydactyla* Leisler, 1814, *Annalen der Wetterautschen Gesellschaft für die Gesammte Naturkunde* 3(2) : 357.

*Vultur perenopterus* Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) 1 : 87.

*Tringa ocropus* Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) 1 : 149.

These names, as originally spelled, are faulty Latin, they offend the cultured mind and are meaningless.

Under Article 19, these names should be regarded as cases of "fautes d'orthographe" or "fautes d'impression" and should be emended to read:—

*Alauda brachydactyla* Leisler.    βραχύς short.    δακτύλος toe.

*Vultur perenopterus* Linnaeus.    περικνός dusky.    πτερον wing.

*Tringa ochropus* Linnaeus.\*    ὀχρός pale yellow.    πους foot.

R. MEINERTZHAGEN : *Chairman of the Standing Committee.*

J. BERLIOZ : *Museum National d'Histoire Naturelle, Paris.*

E. STRESEMANN : *Zoologisches Museum der Universität, Berlin.*

JOHN T. ZIMMER : *The American Museum of Natural History, New York.*

\*See also in this connection pp. 75-76.



**PROPOSED VALIDATION UNDER THE PLENARY POWERS  
OF THE GENERIC NAME "PYRRHOCORAX" TUNSTALL,  
1771 (CLASS AVES) FOR THE CHOUGH**

**Application submitted by the  
Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature of the  
International Ornithological Congress**

**(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)492)**

Covering letter, dated 19th October, 1950, with enclosures, from  
Colonel R. Meinertzhagen, Chairman of the Standing Committee on  
Ornithological Nomenclature of the International Ornithological  
Congress

As Chairman of the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature,  
I beg to forward to you the following recommendation for favour of decision  
by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature.

**ENCLOSURE 1**

**Proposed validation under the plenary powers of the generic  
name "Pyrrhonorax" Tunstall, 1771**

*Pyrrhonorax* Tunstall, 1771, *Orn. Brit.* : 2. Type species of genus by monotypy : *Upupa pyrrhonorax* Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) 1 : 188.

*Coracia* Brisson, 1760, *Orn.* 2 : 3 (with same type species).

The name *Pyrrhonorax* has been used for over one hundred years.

Sharpe (1877, *Cat. Birds Brit. Mus.* 3 : 146) rejects *Coracia* owing to its similarity with *Coracias* Linnaeus. It has since been rejected by many authors as being a faulty transliteration of *Coracias*.

The B.O.U. List Committee (1947 *Ibis* 1947 : 354) adopted the name *Coracia* Brisson as the correct name of the genus *Pyrrhonorax* Tunstall. This change can only lead to confusion.

It is hoped that *Pyrrhonorax* Tunstall, 1771 (type species : *Upupa pyrrhonorax* Linnaeus, 1758) be made a *nomen conservandum* and that *Coracia* Brisson be suppressed.

R. MEINERTZHAGEN : *Chairman of the Standing Committee.*

E. STRESEMANN : *Zoologisches Museum der Universität, Berlin.*

JOHN T. ZIMMER : *The American Museum of Natural History, New York.*

## ENCLOSURE 2

**Note, dated 25th September, 1950, by Professor J. Berlioz  
(Museum National d'Histoire Naturelle, Paris)**

As concerning *Coracia*, the question seems to me much more difficult [than the questions relating to the trivial name of the Song Thrush and the proposed emendation of certain other trivial names dealt with respectively in Applications Z.N.(S.)493 and Z.N.(S.)491, submitted by the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature]. Of course, I myself hate the unnecessary changes in nomenclature. But I believe that the use of the name *Coracias* for the Rollers was adopted at the time when *all* Brisson's names were rejected. Since the generic names given by Brisson were considered as valid by a Zoological Congress, it seems that they must antedate Linné's names given in 1766. So (*most unfortunately, I agree*) *Coracia* would have priority for the Choughs and *Galgulus* for the Rollers. Even *Coracias* cannot be accepted for the latter, as it is clearly stated by Brisson that the Latin *Coracia* is the same as the French "*Coracias*," and *Galgulus* is perfectly valid for the Rollers.

**ON THE APPLICATION RELATING TO THE GENERIC  
NAMES "PYRRHOCORAX" TUNSTALL, 1771, AND  
"CORACIA" BRISSON, 1760 (CLASS AVES), SUBMITTED  
BY THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON ORNITHOLOGICAL  
NOMENCLATURE OF THE INTERNATIONAL ORNITHO-  
LOGICAL NOMENCLATURE**

By FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E.

(Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature)

**(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)492)**

1. The purpose of the present note is twofold: (1) to clear away certain misapprehensions which it appears from the second of the two enclosures submitted by the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature appear to exist regarding the action taken by the International Congress of Zoology and by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature in regard to the status of generic names published in Brisson (M.J.), 1760, *Ornithologie*; (2) to indicate the action which under the established procedure would be necessary in the event of the approval by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature of the recommendations in regard to the generic names *Pyrrhonorax* Tunstall, 1771, and *Coracia* Brisson, 1760, submitted to it by the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature.

**(a) Action taken by the International Congress of Zoology and  
by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature  
in regard to the status of generic names in Brisson, 1760,  
"Ornithologie"**

2. The question of the availability of the generic names published in 1760 in Brisson's *Ornithologie* was first brought before the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature by the late Dr. Ernst Hartert. The exact date of this application is not known but it was presumably a year or more prior to 1911, the year in which the decision of the International Commission on this subject was published in *Opinion* 37. At that time the International Commission (in common with all other zoologists) was much preoccupied with the problem whether under the *Règles* any status attached to generic names published by authors who applied a so-called "binary" system of nomenclature but who did not apply a binominal system of nomenclature. Shortly before the publication of *Opinion* 37 (in regard to Brisson's names), the International Commission adopted an *Opinion*—*Opinion* 20, published in July 1910 (*Smithson. Publ.* **1938** : 48-51)—in regard to the status of generic names published in 1763, by the "binary" but not binominal author Gronovius in his work entitled the *Zoophylacium Gronovianum*. In this *Opinion* the International Commission ruled in favour of the availability under the *Règles* of generic names published by "binary" but not binominal authors. Accordingly, when shortly afterwards, the International Commission came to consider Dr. Hartert's application relating to the status of generic names published in 1760 by the "binary" but admittedly not binominal author M. J. Brisson, it ruled that those names were available under the *Règles*. This ruling, embodied (as already noted) in *Opinion* 37 (1911, *Smithson. Publ.* **2013** : 87-88), was published exactly one year after *Opinion* 20, the *Opinion* on which, as the *Opinion* dealing with the question of principle involved, the validity of the ruling in *Opinion* 37 depended.

3. It is not necessary here to recapitulate in detail the long drawn-out controversy which followed the ruling (given in *Opinion* 20) in favour of the availability of generic names published after 1757 by authors who applied a so-called "binary" but not binominal system of nomenclature. It is sufficient to recall that, in the light of the proceedings at the Eleventh International Congress of Zoology at Padua in 1930, the Twelfth Congress at Lisbon in 1935 invited the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to prepare a comprehensive Report on the issues involved for consideration by the Thirteenth Congress and that the Report, so prepared by the International Commission, secured unanimous approval when it was submitted to the Thirteenth Congress at its meeting in Paris in July, 1948. It is in the light of that Report (for the text of which see, 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **5** : 152-167) and of the decisions thereon taken by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature and by the International Congress of Zoology that the present status of Brisson's generic names must be judged.

4. As will be seen from the Report referred to above, the International Commission (1) reported that the apparently ambiguous phrase "nomenclature binaire" as used in the substantive French text of the *Règles* was (for the reasons there explained) identical in meaning with the expression "nomen-



clature binominale" and recommended that the latter expression, being absolutely clear in meaning, should be substituted for the expression "nomenclature binaire," (2) cancelled those of its earlier *Opinions* (including *Opinion* 37, relating to the status of the generic names published by Brisson in 1760 in *Ornithologia*), which were dependent upon *Opinion* 20 and were therefore now seen to be incorrect, but (3) recognising that many of Brisson's generic names were in general use by ornithologists and being anxious to avoid any action which would lead to unnecessary name-changing, recommended the Congress to make an exception in favour of Brisson's generic names and to accord to them availability under the *Règles*, notwithstanding the fact that Brisson had not (as required by the amended text of Proviso (a) to Article 25) in the *Ornithologia* applied the principles of binominal nomenclature. Readers who are interested in the detailed terms of the decision taken by the International Commission in this matter are referred to the *Official Record of Proceedings* of the International Commission at the Fourth of its Meetings held during its Paris Session (1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4**: 63-66).

5. We see therefore that it was solely for the purpose of promoting stability in ornithological nomenclature and of avoiding unnecessary name-changing that in 1948 the International Commission took the special action described above to provide a legal basis of availability for the generic names published in Brisson's *Ornithologie* of 1760. Neither in this, nor in any other, case, where the International Commission gives a general ruling on the availability of a given book for the purposes of the *Règles*, does the Commission thereby commit itself on the question whether each and every name published in it is free from all objection from the standpoint of stability in zoological nomenclature. For clearly decisions on such questions can only be taken on the basis of detailed information submitted in each individual case concerned. Thus, a decision by the International Commission on the general status of a given book for nomenclatorial purposes in no way fetters the liberty of action of the International Commission in dealing with applications for the use of the plenary powers in relation to individual names first published in the book in question or prejudices the action which at a later date the Commission, on being presented with a statement of the facts, may think it desirable to take for the purpose of furthering stability in nomenclature and preventing confusion.

6. It will be seen therefore that the International Commission is perfectly free to take a decision such as that asked for by the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature in relation to the name *Coracia* Brisson, 1760, if it considers such action desirable. It may be added indeed that, at the time when the Commission recommended the Congress to enter Brisson's *Ornithologia* in the Schedule of available zoological works then agreed to be added to the *Règles*, it was aware that applications for the suppression of certain of the generic names published in the *Ornithologie* might later be received, for already the late Dr. James L. Peters (then Vice-President, later President, of the International Commission) had notified the Secretary that it might be necessary for the Commission to consider such action in individual cases.

**(b) Need for the decision on the application received from the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature in regard to the names "Pyrrhonorax" Tunstall, 1771, and "Coracia" Brisson, 1760, to cover all aspects of the problem involved**

7. Two decisions taken in Paris in 1948 on questions of procedure affect the form and scope of the decision to be taken by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature on the application received from the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature in regard to the names *Pyrrhonorax* Tunstall, 1771, and *Coracia* Brisson, 1760. The first of these decisions, a decision taken by the International Commission itself, is that, contrary to the practice adopted in the case of certain of its earlier *Opinions*, the decision to be taken in any given case is in future to cover all the points involved in the problem in question and not be confined to certain aspects of that problem of special interest to the applicant from whom the case had been received (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 355). The second of the decisions referred to above was that by which the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology laid upon the International Commission the duty of placing upon the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* (or, as the case may be, the corresponding *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names*) the name of any genus, on which a ruling is given by the Commission, and upon the *Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology* (or, as the case may be, the corresponding *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Trivial Names*) any trivial name in respect of which a decision may be given by the Commission (including the trivial names of the type species of genera, the names of which are placed on the *Official List of Generic Names*, except where any such trivial name is not the oldest available such name for the species in question) (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 267-271, 334).

8. Under the decisions referred to above, the decision to be taken on the present application will need to deal with the following matters :—

- (1) Since the application involves the question of the status of the name *Coracias* Linnaeus, 1758 (*Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) **1** : 107) as the generic name for the Rollers in relation to the name of the objectively identical nominal genus *Galgulus* Brisson, 1760 (*Ornithologie* : **1** : 30 ; **2** : 64) (see Enclosure 2 to application submitted), it will be necessary for this subject to be dealt with in the *Opinion* rendered on this application. Since *Galgulus* Brisson, 1760, is an objective junior synonym of *Coracias* Linnaeus, 1758 (type species, by subsequent selection by Sélby, [1825], *Ill. brit. Orn.* **1** (Landbirds) : xxvii) : *Coracias garrulus* Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) **1** : 107), no difficulty of any kind arises, all that is necessary being (a) that the generic name *Coracias* Linnaeus, 1758 (type species as above) should be placed on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*, (b) that the name *Galgulus* Brisson, 1760, should be placed on the corresponding *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names*, and (c) that the trivial name *garrulus* Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Coracias garrulus*) should be placed on the *Official List of Specific Trivial Names*.

- (2) If the International Commission decides to grant the principal part of the request addressed to it and therefore to suppress the name *Coracia* Brisson, 1760 (*Ornithologie* 1: 30; 2: 3) under its plenary powers, thereby validating the name *Pyrhcorax* Tunstall, 1771 (*Orn. Brit.* : 2) (type species, by monotypy: *Upupa pyrrhcorax* Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) 1: 118), the first of these names will need to be placed on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names*, the second, on the *Official List of Generic Names*. If, however, the Commission were to reject the present application, the name *Pyrhcorax* Tunstall, 1771, would need to be placed on the *Official Index* and *Coracia* Brisson, 1760, on the *Official List*. In either case, the trivial name *pyrrhcorax* Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Upupa pyrrhcorax*) will need to be placed on the *Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology*.
- (3) Next, it must be noted that in (for example) Neave's *Nomenclator zoologicus* there is noted a generic name *Pyrhcorax* Moehring, 1758 (*Geslach. Vogel.* (Nozem. & Vosm. ed.) : 1, 15), which, if an available name, would invalidate the name *Pyrhcorax* Tunstall, 1771, which would then become a junior homonym. Fortunately, however, in this case also, no difficulty arises, since at its Session held in Paris in 1948 the Commission gave a ruling (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 4: 566-568) that the *Geslachten der Vogelen* (the translation into Dutch of the pre-1758 work published by Moehring in 1752 under the title *Avium Genera*) is not available under the *Règles*, Nozeman and Vosmaer not having (as required by *Opinion* 5) reinforced the names in this book by adoption or acceptance. Accordingly, all that will be necessary in this connection will be that the invalid name *Pyrhcorax* Moehring, 1758, should be placed on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names*.
- (4) It must be noted also that, in addition to the name *Pyrhcorax* Nozeman & Vosmaer, 1758, discussed above, there is also a name *Pyrhcorax* Brisson, 1760 (*Ornithologie* 2: 30-31), of which due account must be taken. In considering this name two points must be noted: (a) that within any given assemblage of species treated by him as constituting a "genus," Brisson did not regard himself as in any way bound to cite all the included species under the name of the genus so accepted and indeed very frequently cited the included species under two or more generic (or subgeneric) names, (b) where a species had by previous (pre-1758) authors been known by a univocal specific name and where Brisson adopted for the genus (or the subgenus) concerned the same word as that by which the species in question had previously been known, Brisson, though a "binary" (but not binominal) author, himself cited the species under a scientific name consisting of the single word which thus denoted both the group (? subgenus) to which Brisson considered the species to belong and also the species itself. In the case with which we are here concerned, namely Brisson's "Genus XIV," the genus *Corvus*, Brisson included ten species but of these he cited only one under the



name "Corvus" (here used to denote tautonymy in the manner explained above), the other nine species being cited under the names *Cornix* (4 species), *Pyrrhocorax* (1 species), *Monedula* (4 species). The species to which Brisson applied the generic (or subgeneric) name *Pyrrhocorax* is, according to the synonymy given by Brisson, the "*Pyrrhocorax*" of Gesner and of Aldrovandus. This species, called by Brisson in French "*Le Choucas des Alpes*," was stated by him to be somewhat larger than the "*Choucas ordinaire*" (the jackdaw) and was figured by him as fig. 2 on plate 1 of volume 2 of the *Ornithologie*. Colonel Richard Meinertzhagen, who, at my request, has kindly examined Brisson's description and figure, has informed me (in litt., 13th September 1952) that this bird of Brisson's is the Alpine Chough. If no action were now taken in connection with the name *Pyrrhocorax* Brisson, the suppression (as proposed by the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature) of the name *Coracia* Brisson, 1760, would not (as is the purpose of the proposed suppression of this name) validate *Pyrrhocorax* Tunstall, 1771, for the Chough, for that name, though no longer a junior objective synonym of *Coracia* Brisson, would still be an invalid name, as it would remain a junior homonym of *Pyrrhocorax* Brisson, 1760. Accordingly, in order to secure the object sought by the Standing Committee, it would be necessary for the Commission to use its plenary powers not only to suppress *Coracia* Brisson, 1760, but also to suppress the name *Pyrrhocorax* Brisson.

- (5) The rule that junior homonyms or junior objective synonyms, when encountered, should be placed on the appropriate *Official Index* will mean that the following names should now be placed on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names*: (1) *Coracias* Hermannsen, 1847, *Ind. Gen. Malac.* 1: 303; (2) *Galgulus* Latreille, [1802-1803], (in Sonnini's Buffon), *Hist. nat. gén. partic. Crust. Ins.* 3: 252; (3) *Galgulus* Wagler, 1827, *Syst. Avium* 1: sign. 21 (15); (4) *Galgulus* Kittlitz, 1832, *Kupfertaf. Nat. Vögel* (1): 7; (5) *Pyrrhocorax* Vieillot, 1816, *Analyse*: 36.
- (6) Finally, it must be recalled that the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology inserted in the provisions relating to the use by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature of the plenary powers conferred upon it (now to be incorporated into the *Règles*) an instruction that, where those powers were used to suppress a name for the purpose of validating a name of later date, the suppression so made should be limited to the status of the name in question in relation to the Law of Priority and should not affect its status in relation to the Law of Homonymy (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 4: 339). Under this decision (the purpose of which was to prevent the suppression of a name for the foregoing limited purpose from having the unintended effect of validating some homonym of later date that had previously been rejected or of making it possible to publish for some other taxonomic unit, as a valid name, a name consisting of the same word as that of the name suppressed), the

suppression of the name *Coracia* Brisson, 1760, if decided upon by the International Commission, will necessarily be confined to its status in relation to the Law of Priority, its position in relation to the Law of Homonymy remaining unaffected. Thus, the name *Coracia* Hübner, [1819] (*Verz. bekannt. Schmett.* (11) : 168) will remain an invalid junior homonym of *Coracia* Brisson, 1760, and should accordingly be placed on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names*, together with the later (inadvertently published) name *Coracia* Moersch, 1865 (*J. Conchylol.* 13 : 385).

8. Having now examined the various subsidiary matters on which action will, under the rules of procedure, be required as part of the decision to be taken on the application regarding the names *Pyrhcorax* and *Coracia* submitted by the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature of the International Ornithological Congress, I summarise as follows, in agreement with Colonel Meinertzhagen, the form and scope of the decision required in the event of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature deciding to approve the application so submitted. In that event, it would be necessary for the International Commission :—

(1) to use its plenary powers to suppress :—

- (a) the name *Coracia* Brisson, 1760, for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy ;
- (b) the name *Pyrhcorax* Brisson, 1760, for the purposes of both the Law of Priority and the Law of Homonymy ;

(2) to place the under-mentioned generic names on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* :—

- (a) *Coracias* Linnaeus, 1758 (type species, by selection by Sélby, [1825] : *Coracias garrulus* Linnaeus, 1758) ;
- (b) *Pyrhcorax* Tunstall, 1771 (type species, by monotypy : *Upupa pyrhcorax* Linnaeus, 1758) ;

(3) to place the under-mentioned trivial names on the *Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology* :—

- (a) *garrulus* Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Coracias garrulus*) (trivial name of type species of *Coracias* Linnaeus, 1758)
- (b) *pyrhcorax* Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Upupa pyrhcorax*) (trivial name of type species of *Pyrhcorax* Tunstall, 1771) ;

(4) to place the under-mentioned generic names on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* :—

- (a) *Coracia* Brisson, 1760 (as proposed, under (1) (a) above, to be suppressed under the plenary powers for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy)

- (b) *Coracia* Hübner, [1819] (a junior homonym of *Coracia* Brisson, 1760)
- (c) *Coracia* Moerch, 1865 (a junior homonym of *Coracia* Brisson, 1760)
- (d) *Coracias* Herrmannsen, 1847 (a junior homonym of *Coracias* Linnaeus 1758)
- (e) *Galgulus* Brisson, 1760 (a junior objective synonym of *Coracias* Linnaeus, 1758)
- (f) *Galgulus* Latreille, [1802-1803] (a junior homonym of *Galgulus* Brisson, 1760)
- (g) *Galgulus* Wagler, 1827 (a junior homonym of *Galgulus* Brisson, 1760)
- (h) *Galgulus* Kittlitz, 1832 (a junior homonym of *Galgulus* Brisson, 1760)
- (i) *Pyrrhacorax* Nozeman & Vosmaer, (*in* Mochring), 1758 (a name published in a book declared by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to possess no status in zoological nomenclature)
- (j) *Pyrrhacorax* Brisson, 1760 (as proposed, under (1) (b) above, to be suppressed under the plenary powers ;
- (k) *Pyrrhacorax* Vieillot, 1816 (a junior homonym of *Pyrrhacorax* Tunstall, 1771).

9. Having thus summarised the action required in the event of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature deciding to grant the application submitted by the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature, it is necessary to consider also the action which would be required if the Commission were to take a decision in the opposite sense. This may be summarised as follows by reference to the four main Points enumerated in the immediately preceding paragraph :—

- (i) Point (1) in paragraph 8 would need to be replaced by a new sentence placing on record the refusal of the International Commission to 1760. use its plenary powers to suppress the generic name *Coracia* Brisson,
- (ii) Under Point (2) the name *Coracia* Brisson, 1760, would be placed on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* in place of *Pyrrhacorax* Tunstall, 1771. The name *Coracias* Linnaeus, 1758, would still need to be placed on the *Official List*, for it is not a homonym of *Coracia* Brisson, 1760 (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 4 : 161-162, where are set out the criteria adopted by the International Congress of Zoology for determining whether any given pair of generic names are homonyms of one another).
- (iii) No change would need to be made in Point (3), except that it would be necessary to amend the note to the entry relating to the trivial name *pyrrhacorax* Linnaeus, 1758, by substituting therein the name *Coracia* Brisson, 1760, for the name *Pyrrhacorax* Tunstall, 1771.
- (iv) In Point (4) the only changes needed would be the deletion of the name *Coracia* Brisson, 1760 (sub-point (a)) and the insertion between the existing subpoints (h) and (i) of a new point reading : “ *Pyrrhacorax* Tunstall, 1771 (a junior objective synonym of *Coracia* Brisson, 1760).”



**PROPOSED USE OF THE PLENARY POWERS TO VALIDATE THE TRIVIAL NAME "PHILOMELOS" BREHM, 1831 (AS PUBLISHED IN THE BINOMINAL COMBINATION "TURDUS PHILOMELOS") AS THE TRIVIAL NAME OF THE SONG THRUSH**

**Application submitted by the  
Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature of the  
International Ornithological Congress**

**(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)493)**

Covering letter dated 19th October, 1950, with enclosure, from Colonel R. Meinertzhagen, Chairman of the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature of the International Ornithological Congress

As Chairman of the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature, I beg to forward to you the following recommendation for favour of decision by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature.

**ENCLOSURE**

**"*Turdus philomelos*" versus "*Turdus ericetorum*"**

*Turdus philomelos* Brehm, 1831 (*Handb. Naturg. Vog. Deutschl.*: 322) ("Germany") is the name which has been used for about forty-five years for the Song Thrush.

*Turdus ericetorum* Turton, 1807 (*Brit. Faun.* **1**: 35) ("England"), founded on plate 63 of Lewin's *British Birds* (**2**: 68) published in 1796, was adopted without explanation in 1934 (*Ibis* **76**: 635) for the Song Thrush by the Nomenclature Committee of the British Ornithologists' Union, as it antedates *Turdus philomelos* Brehm, 1831.

In 1924 (*Ibis* **66**: 158) the British Committee had rejected Turton's name, as Lewin's figure is not definitely assignable to the Song Thrush and possibly represents an American Thrush. This doubt still remains, especially as Lewin states that his bird is perfectly distinguishable from the Song Thrush, with which he was well acquainted. Lewin also states that his bird "has a short black mark passing through the eye," which is not a character of the Song Thrush.

It is therefore hoped that *Turdus ericetorum* Turton be rejected, in favour of an old-established name *Turdus philomelos* Brehm, as indeterminable.

R. MEINERTZHAGEN: *Chairman of the Standing Committee.*

J. BERLIOZ: *Museum National d'Histoire Naturelle, Paris.*

E. STRESEMANN: *Zoologisches Museum der Universität, Berlin.*

JOHN T. ZIMMER: *The American Museum of Natural History, New York.*

**ON THE PROPOSED USE OF THE PLENARY POWERS TO  
SECURE THAT THE TRIVIAL NAME "PHILOMELOS"  
BREHM, 1831 (AS PUBLISHED IN THE BINOMINAL COM-  
BINATION "TURDUS PHILOMELOS") SHALL BE OLDEST  
AVAILABLE NAME FOR THE SONG THRUSH**

By FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E.

(Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature)

**(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)493)**

**1.** The application submitted by the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature of the International Ornithological Congress is concerned to secure that the trivial name *philomelos* Brehm, 1831 (as published in the binominal combination *Turdus philomelos*) shall become the undisputed oldest available trivial name for the Song Thrush. For this purpose it will be necessary to remove the competition of the older trivial name *ericetorum* Turton, 1807 (as published in the binominal combination *Turdus ericetorum*), a name which by some specialists has been identified as a senior subjective synonym of the trivial name *philomelos* Brehm, but by others is regarded as a *nomen dubium*.

**2.** Prior to the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology held in Paris in 1948, the provisions in the *Règles* relating to the method to be followed in determining the identity of the taxonomic species with which any given nominal species should be identified were of the most primitive and inadequate kind, consisting only of Article 31 which laid down the following rule: "La subdivision d'une espèce en deux ou plusieurs autres est soumise aux mêmes règles que la subdivision d'un genre." Thus, by the objectionable device of legislation by reference the Rules in Article 30, relating to the determination of the type species of a given nominal genus were applied (so far as applicable) to the determination of the type specimen of a nominal species. But the question of the trivial name to be applied to a given taxonomic species may sometimes depend (as in the case now submitted by the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature) upon an entirely different question, namely the procedure to be followed when there is a trivial name which all are agreed is applicable to the species in question but there is also an older trivial name which by some authors is regarded as being applicable to that species but by others as referring to some other known species or as being indeterminable. On this subject Article 31 was entirely silent.

**3.** During the revision of the *Règles* in Paris in 1948 particular attention was given to the need for substituting a clear and comprehensive set of rules in place of the totally inadequate provisions of the existing Article 31. This subject was discussed at length at the Fourth Public Meeting held by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature during its Paris Session, when detailed proposals (subsequently approved by the Congress) were drawn up for an Article to replace the previous Article 31 (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4**: 73-76). These new rules deal specifically with both aspects of the question involved: first the new rules provide expressly for the procedure to be followed in determining the lectotype of any given nominal species (or, in default of an actual lectotype, the single figure, illustration or previously published

description cited in the original description of the nominal species concerned, to represent the lectotype of that species); second, the new rules lay it down that "where some but not all specialists claim to be able to recognise the taxonomic species represented by the nominal species in question or where there is disagreement among specialists as to the taxonomic species so to be recognised, the question at issue is to be referred to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature for decision."

4. The present application falls to be dealt with under the provision quoted above. Under that provision, it is possible for the International Commission, according to the circumstances of the case, to put a stop to confusion, either (1) by prescribing the taxonomic species to which the disputed trivial name is to be held to be applicable, or (2) by using its plenary powers to suppress the trivial name in question. The second of these courses is that which the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature has asked the International Commission to adopt in the present instance. Accordingly, if the Commission approve the application submitted to it, it will be necessary for the Commission :—

- (1) to declare the specific name *Turdus ericetorum* Turton, 1807, to be a *nomen dubium*, and to use its plenary powers to suppress the trivial name *ericetorum* Turton, 1807 (as published in the binominal combination *Turdus ericetorum*) for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy ;
- (2) to place the trivial name *philomelos* Brehm, 1831 (as published in the binominal combination *Turdus philomelos*) on the *Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology* ;
- (3) to place the trivial name *ericetorum* Turton, 1807 (as published in the binominal combination *Turdus ericetorum*), as proposed, under (1) above, to be suppressed under the plenary powers for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy, on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Trivial Names in Zoology*.



**PROPOSED USE OF THE PLENARY POWERS TO SUPPRESS THREE COMPLETELY OVERLOOKED TRIVIAL NAMES APPLIED BY LINNAEUS TO NORTH AMERICAN BIRDS IN 1776, TOGETHER WITH AN EQUALLY OVERLOOKED GENERIC NAME PUBLISHED ON THE SAME OCCASION**

**Application submitted by  
Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature of the  
International Ornithological Congress  
(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)502)**

Covering letter dated 19th October 1950, from Colonel R. Meinertzhagen, Chairman of the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature.

As Chairman of the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature, I have received an application signed by nine American ornithologists asking that the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature should permanently suppress three trivial names proposed by Linnaeus for North American birds, the publication of which in 1776 has been brought to light through papers by Mr. W. L. McAtee published in 1949 and 1950 respectively. The three names which form the subject of the foregoing application were published in a hitherto entirely overlooked list entitled "A Catalogue of the Birds, Beasts, Fishes, Insects, Plants, etc., contained in Edwards' Natural History."

The application received in regard to these names is submitted herewith for consideration by the International Commission (Enclosure 1). That application has been considered by the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature, the statement prepared by which is now submitted as Enclosure 2.

The three trivial names covered by the present application namely *lutea* Linnaeus, 1776 (as published in the combination *Muscicapa lutea*), *pennsylvanica* Linnaeus, 1776 (as published in the combination *Passer pennsylvanica*), and *americ.* [sic] Linnaeus, 1776 (as published in the combination *Vermivora americ.* [sic]) have never been used for the species concerned, apart from the occasion on which they were first published. The same is true of the generic name *Vermivora* Linnaeus, 1776, the name used as the generic name for the third of the foregoing species. The introduction at this date of the foregoing names would cause much unnecessary confusion and would serve no useful purpose whatever. It is for this reason that the International Commission is accordingly asked (1) to use its plenary powers to suppress for the purposes, both of the Law of Priority and of the Law of Homonymy (a) the generic name *Vermivora* Linnaeus, 1776, and (b) the three specific trivial names specified above, (2) to place the foregoing names on the appropriate *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Names*, (3) to place on the *Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology* the trivial names currently used for the species concerned, namely: (i) the name *magnolia* Wilson, 1811 (as published in the combination *Sylvia magnolia*), (ii) the name *albicollis* Gmelin, 1789 (as published in the combination *Fringilla albicollis*), (iii) the name *vermivora* Gmelin, 1789 (as published in the combination *Motacilla vermivora*); (4) to place the name *Helmitheros*

Rafinesque, 1815 (gender of generic name : neuter) (type species, by monotypy ; *Motacilla vermivora* Gmelin, 1789) on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*.

## ENCLOSURE 1

### Application submitted by nine American ornithologists

The International Zoological Congress at Monaco (1913) adopted a special article appended to the International Code of Zoological Nomenclature which gives the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature authority to suspend the rules if their application would result in greater confusion than uniformity. This rule is to be applied specifically in cases where long-forgotten names are unearthed that have priority over well-established names. At the International Ornithological Congress at Uppsala a committee was established at the suggestion of the Secretary of the International Commission, Mr. Francis Hemming, to collaborate with the International Commission with particular reference to the Monaco Resolution. The undersigned submit to this committee the following request for a suspension of the rule of priority in order to preserve three well-known names of North American birds. We ask the committee to endorse our application and to forward it to the International Commission.

2. The work in which the overlooked names occur is a publication by Linnaeus, consisting of a catalogue of the birds and other animals contained in Edwards' *Natural History*, published in 1776. All the details about this publication are presented by Mr. James L. Peters, 1950 (*Auk*. **67** : 375-377). Eighteen new names are proposed in this publication, but many of them are actually only misspellings of established names. In only three cases is the nomenclature of accepted bird names threatened. They are as follows :—

(1) Magnolia Warbler. The species name *magnolia* Wilson, 1811 (*Sylvia magnolia* Wilson, 1811, *Amer. Ornith.* **3** : 63) has been applied to this species for many generations. The name is antedated by *Muscicapa lutea* Linnaeus, 1776 (: 11) in the recently discovered publication.

(2) White-throated Sparrow. This species has been known for more than 150 years under the name *albicollis* Gmelin (*Fringillo albicollis* Gmelin, 1789, in Linnaeus, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 13) **1**(2) : 96). This name is antedated by *Passer pensylvanica* Linnaeus, 1776 (: 13).

(3) Worm-eating Warbler. This species has been known under the name *vermivora* Gmelin, 1789 (*Motacilla vermivora* Gmelin, 1789, in Linnaeus, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 13) **1**(2) : 951), for more than 150 years. It is antedated by *Vermivora americ.* Linnaeus, 1776 (: 13).

3. So far as known, none of the three Linnaean names has been cited in the literature between 1776 and 1949 when Mr. McAtee first called attention to this publication. The names had thus been forgotten for a period of 173 years. On the other hand, the names which they would replace are the well-established names of some of our most familiar birds. They have been listed literally in many thousands of publications.

4. This is clearly a case in which strict adherence to priority would result in greater confusion than uniformity. The International Commission is therefore requested to place the Linnaean names *Muscicapa lutea*, *Passer pensylvanica* and *Vermivora americ.* on the list of *nomina rejecta*, and in turn to place the

names *Sylvia magnolia* Wilson, 1811, *Fringilla albicollis* Gmelin, 1789, and *Motacilla vermivora* Gmelin, 1789, on the list of *nomina conservanda*.

5. Failure of speedy action on this request would result in grave damage to the prestige of taxonomy.

E. R. BLAKE (*Chicago Natural History Museum, Chicago, Ill.*)

H. G. DEIGNAN (*U.S. National Museum, Washington, D.C.*)

JOHN J. EMLIN, Jr. (*Zoological Laboratory, University of Wisconsin*)

ALDEN H. MILLER (*California*)

FRANK A. PITELKA (*Museum of Vertebrate Zoology, University of California, Berkeley*)

A. L. RAND (*Chicago Natural History Museum, Chicago, Ill.*)

CHARLES H. ROGERS (*Princeton, New Jersey*)

M. A. TRAYLOR, Jr. (*Chicago Natural History Museum, Chicago, Ill.*)

ALBERT WOLFSON (*North Western University, Evanston, Ill.*)

## ENCLOSURE 2

### Statement prepared by the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature

1. The generic name *Vermivora* Linnaeus, 1776, *Cat. Birds, Beasts, Fishes, Insects . . . in Edwards' Natural History* : 13.

It is recommended that the above name should be made a *nomen rejectum* and that the following name by which the genus concerned is now known should be made a *nomen conservandum* ;—*Helmitheros* Rafinesque, 1819, *J. Physique* **88** : 418 (type species, by monotypy : *Motacilla vermivora* Gmelin, 1789, in Linnaeus, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 13) **1**(2)951).

2. The trivial name comprised in the specific name *Muscicapa lutea* Linnaeus, 1776, *ibid.* : 11.

It is recommended that the above name be made a *nomen rejectum* and that the trivial name comprised in the name currently accepted for this species, namely *Sylvia magnolia* Wilson, 1811, *Amer. Ornith.* **3** : 63, be made a *nomen conservandum*.

3. The trivial name comprised in the specific name *Passer pensylvanica* Linnaeus, 1776, *ibid.* : 13.

It is recommended that the above name be made a *nomen rejectum* and that the trivial name comprised in the specific name currently accepted for this species, namely *Fringilla albicollis* Gmelin, 1789, in Linnaeus, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 13) **1**(2) : 96 ("Pennsylvania"), be made a *nomen conservandum*.

4. The trivial name comprised in the specific name *Vermivora americ.* [sic] Linnaeus, 1776, *ibid.* : 13.

It is recommended that the above name be made a *nomen rejectum* and that the trivial name comprised in the specific name currently accepted for this species, namely *Motacilla vermivora* Gmelin, 1789, in Linnaeus, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 13) **1**(2) : 951 ("Pennsylvania"), be made a *nomen conservandum*.

R. MEINERTZHAGEN, *Chairman of the Standing Committee.*

E. STRESEMANN, *Zoologisches Museum der Universität, Berlin.*

JOHN T. ZIMMER, *The American Museum of Natural History, New York.*



**ON THE PROPOSAL BY THE NOMENCLATURE COMMITTEE OF THE  
AMERICAN MUSEUM OF NATURAL HISTORY, NEW YORK, FOR THE  
SUPPRESSION UNDER THE PLenary POWERS OF THE LINNEAN  
NAMES PUBLISHED IN 1776 IN THE "CATALOGUE OF EDWARDS'  
NATURAL HISTORY" WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO THE NEW  
NAMES FOR BIRDS**

By FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E.

(Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature)

(Commission's references Z.N.(S.)502 and 649)

When the International Commission comes to consider the application submitted by the Nomenclature Committee of the American Museum of Natural History, New York, that the plenary powers should be used to suppress all the new names by Linnaeus published in 1776 in the *Catalogue of Edwards' Natural History* (Bull. zool. Nomencl. 6 : 163), it will be necessary to consider two questions which would call for decision if it were proposed to take action in the sense recommended.

2. The points to be considered are :—

- (1) If this work were to be suppressed for nomenclatorial purposes, should that suppression be absolute (i.e. should that suppression apply for the purposes both of the Law of Priority and of the Law of Homonymy) or should it be limited, either for all names in the book or for some of them, to the Law of Priority ?
- (2) If the whole work were to be suppressed for either or both of the foregoing purposes, what steps ought to be taken to give effect in this case to the general direction of the International Congress of Zoology that adequate measures should be taken to ensure that the decision so taken is clearly related to the individual names involved (1950, Bull. zool. Nomencl. 4 : 334).

3. On Point (1) the position is, so far as I know, that in one group only has a detailed survey been made of the new names in this *Catalogue*. The group concerned is the birds, as regards which Dr. James L. Peters (*Museum of Comparative Zoology, Cambridge, Mass., U.S.A.*) has published (1950, *Auk* 67 : 375-377) a complete list of the names involved. In view of the fact that the names concerned have thus acquired considerable prominence, I suggest that, if the Commission were to use its plenary powers to suppress this work, the logical course, as regards the bird names, would be to suppress them for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy. The effect of such a decision would be to prevent these names or any of them from taking priority over names in current use but at the same time, by maintaining the status of these names for purposes of homonymy, to prevent the confusion which might arise if the same trivial names were later to be applied to other species in the genera concerned. In the case of the groups, other than birds, no publicity in modern times has, so far as I am aware, been given to the names in question ; it would seem appropriate, therefore, that, if the names in this *Catalogue* are to be rejected, the names of taxonomic units belonging to groups other than birds should be suppressed absolutely, that is, both for the purposes of the Law of Priority and also for those of the Law of Homonymy.

4. On Point (2), it would be necessary, if the *Catalogue* were to be suppressed, to ask specialists in the various groups concerned to examine that work and to report which names in it were new and would therefore be affected by the general decision taken. The names so reported would then be placed on the *Official Indexes of Rejected and Invalid Names*. In the case of the bird names in the *Catalogue* the required information is already available through the paper by Dr. Peters referred to in paragraph 3 above, where it is shown that in the *Catalogue* there are one generic name and eighteen trivial names which are either new or have been so changed in spelling as, in Dr. Peters' opinion, to rank as new names. Particulars regarding these names have been extracted from Dr. Peters' paper and are given in the annexes attached hereto.

## ANNEXE 1

One new generic name for a bird by Linnaeus published in 1776 in the  
"Catalogue of Edwards' Natural History"

*Vermivora* Linnaeus, 1776 (: 13); a name based upon plate 305. This name antedates the name *Vermivora* Swainson, 1827.

## ANNEXE 2

New trivial names for birds by Linnaeus published in 1776 in the "Catalogue of  
Edwards' Natural History"

New Name	Page in "Catalogue" where name given	Plate in Edwards' "Nat. Hist." on which name based	Modern equivalent (as worked out by Dr. James L. Peters)
<i>americ, Vermivora</i>	13	305	<i>Motacilla vermivora</i> Gmelin, 1789
<i>araracina, Psittacus</i>	9	159	<i>Psittacus ararauna</i> Linnaeus, 1758
<i>bicator, Coracias</i>	13	320	considered to be unidentifiable
<i>calidris, Motacitta</i> [sic]	8	121	species figured not recognisable
<i>cinereus, Todos</i> [sic]	12	262	<i>Todus cinereus</i> Linnaeus, 1766
<i>dominica, Loxia</i>	8	127	<i>Loxia dominicana</i> Linnaeus, 1758
<i>falcolinus, Tetrao</i>	11	246	<i>Tetrao francolinus</i> Linnaeus, 1766
<i>globifera, Crax</i>	13	295	<i>Crax globicera</i> Linnaeus, 1766
<i>hybrida, Meleagris</i>	14	337	<i>Lyrurus tetrix</i> x <i>Phasianus colchicus</i>
<i>lutea, Muscicapa</i>	11	255	<i>Sylvia magnolia</i> Wilson, 1811
<i>nyctelea, Strix</i>	II	61	<i>Strix nyctea</i> Linnaeus, 1758 ( <i>Strix</i> <i>scandiac</i> Linnaeus, 1758)
<i>pensylvanica</i> [sic], <i>Passer</i>	13	304	<i>Fringilla albicollis</i> Gmelin, 1789
<i>senegallensis, Picus</i>	9	182	<i>Picus benghalensis</i> Linnaeus, 1758
<i>spectrum, Psittacus</i>	13	315	<i>Psittacus fuscus</i> Müller (P.L.S.), 1776
<i>spectrum, Psittacus</i>	13	316	<i>Psittacus aterrimus</i> Gmelin, 1788
<i>umbellatus, Tetrao</i>	11	248	<i>Tetrao umbellus</i> Linnaeus, 1766
<i>voarula, Motacilla</i>	12	259	<i>Motacilla boarula</i> Linnaeus, 1771
<i>zeylonicus, Turdus</i>	13	321	<i>Turdus zeylonus</i> Linnaeus, 1766

**FIRST REPORT ON THE SPECIES WHICH UNDER THE  
"RÈGLES" ARE THE TYPE SPECIES OF CERTAIN  
GENERA OF BIRDS DISCUSSED, BUT LEFT UNSETTLED,  
IN "OPINION" 16**

By FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E.

(Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature)

**Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)274**

During its Session of Meetings held in Paris in 1948, the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature decided, in accordance with its earlier decision that names ought not to be discussed in its *Opinions* without decisions being given in regard to the questions at issue (1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 355), that steps should be taken as soon as possible to determine, and to render *Opinions* regarding, the species to be accepted as the type species of a long list of nominal genera enumerated in *Opinion* 16 (1910, *Smithson. Publ.* **1938** : 31-39) as possibly having had their type species determined under Linnean tautonymy (i.e. by the citation of a tautonymous pre-1758 univocal specific name for one, but not more than one, of the included nominal species), on which however no decision was given in that *Opinion*. The Commission decided (1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 580-583) to invite the Secretary to make inquiries in regard to each of the generic names concerned for the purpose of ascertaining the views currently held by specialists on the question whether, as regards each of the genera so named, the generic name was available nomenclatorially, the genus was a taxonomically valid genus, and the species accepted as its type species was the species which, as shown in the second paragraph of *Opinion* 16 (1947, *Opinions and Declarations rendered by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature* **1** : 259-261), would be the type species if Rule (d) in Article 30, as interpreted by *Opinion* 16, were in fact applicable to the name of the genus in question. The Commission agreed further that, where (1) the foregoing inquiry showed that the type species of any one of the nominal genera discussed in *Opinion* 16 was the species there provisionally indicated as such, (2) that the nominal genus in question was currently treated by specialists as being taxonomically valid and as having, as its type species, the species referred to above, the name of that genus should forthwith be placed on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*, and that in any case where any of the foregoing conditions were not satisfied, the status of the name concerned should be determined separately as soon as possible after the receipt of the Secretary's Report.

**2.** The present Report is concerned with the names of the twenty-two nominal genera of birds covered by the foregoing decision. In each case I have investigated the position, as disclosed by the current literature, and, in doing so, I have conferred with a number of interested specialists. In order to secure the widest possible publicity for this investigation, I have in addition published a note on the issues to be determined, at the same time appealing to specialists for comments and assistance in regard to the names in question (1952, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **7** : 201-202).



3. As a first step in the present investigation I examined the manner in which each of the nominal genera concerned was treated by Linnaeus in the Tenth Edition of the *Systema Naturae*, for the purpose of determining whether there was a *prima facie* case for considering that the type species of the genus concerned had there been "indicated" by Linnean tautonymy as defined in *Opinion* 16, as further clarified in 1948 by the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology on the recommendation of the International Commission (1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 4: 155). This investigation showed:—

- (1) that there were *prima facie* grounds for considering that the type species of the following eighteen nominal genera had been indicated in 1758 by Linnean tautonymy:—*Caprimulgus*; *Certhia*; *Corvus*; *Cuculus*; *Fringilla*; *Fulica*; *Loxia*; *Meleagris*; *Merops*; *Motacilla*; *Pavo*; *Pelecanus*; *Phasianus*; *Scolopax*; *Sterna*; *Strix*; *Tringa*; *Upupa*;
- (2) that in the following cases it was a matter for consideration whether a single cautionary universal specific name had been clearly cited in the synonymy of any of the included species: *Otis*; *Tetrao*; *Vultur*;
- (3) that in the case of the genus *Charadrius* Linnaeus, 1758, the tautonymous universal pre-1758 specific name "Charadrius" had been cited in the synonymy of more than one of the included species (being so cited both for *Charadrius hiaticula* and for *Charadrius oediconemus*) and therefore that the type species of the genus *Charadrius* Linnaeus, 1758, was not "indicated" by Linnean tautonymy.

4. The names cited in paragraph 3(2) and (3) above (i.e. *Otis* Linnaeus, 1758; *Tetrao* Linnaeus, 1758; *Vultur* Linnaeus, 1758; *Charadrius* Linnaeus, 1758) are not dealt with in the present Report, being reserved for later consideration in the light of comments and advice received from specialists.

5. The second step in the inquiry remitted to me was to ascertain whether in each of the eighteen cases specified in paragraph 3(1) above the nominal species which there were *prima facie* grounds for considering as having been "indicated" by Linnaeus in 1758 by Linnean tautonymy as the type species of the genus concerned was currently accepted by specialists as being the type species of the genus in question. This investigation showed that in every case except that of *Strix* Linnaeus, 1758, the nominal species indicated as the type species by Linnean tautonymy was currently accepted as such. The case of *Strix* Linnaeus is accordingly reserved, like that of the names referred to in paragraph 4 above, for further consideration in the light of comments and advice from specialists. In the remaining seventeen cases the generic name concerned is currently accepted by specialists as the name of a taxonomically valid genus. Further, the trivial name of the type species of each of these nominal genera is an available name and is currently accepted by specialists as the name of a taxonomically valid species.

6. Having now completed the first stage of the investigation remitted to

me, I submit the following conclusions for consideration :—

- (1) The seventeen generic names enumerated in Appendix 1 to the present Report are nomenclatorially available and are currently accepted by specialists as the names of taxonomically valid genera, and the species currently accepted as the type species of each of the nominal genera concerned is the nominal species indicated as such by Linnaeus in 1758 by Linnean tautonymy. Accordingly under the decision taken in 1948 by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature (1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 583, Point (3)(a)), these names are due now to be placed upon the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*.
- (2) The seventeen specific trivial names enumerated in Appendix 2 to the present Report, being respectively the trivial names of the type species of the nominal genera referred to in (1) above, should, under the regulations governing the admission of names to the *Official Lists* (1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 270), be placed on the *Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology* at the same time that, under (1) above, the names of the nominal genera, of which the species bearing these trivial names are the respective type species, are placed on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* :
- (3) The five remaining generic names remitted to me for investigation (*Charadrius* Linnaeus, 1758 ; *Otis* Linnaeus, 1758 ; *Strix* Linnaeus, 1758 ; *Tetrao* Linnaeus, 1758 ; *Vultur* Linnaeus, 1758) will be dealt with in later Reports on the conclusion of consultations with interested specialists.

FRANCIS HEMMING,

*Secretary to the International Commission on  
Zoological Nomenclature.*

28 Park Village East,  
Regent's Park,  
LONDON, N.W.1, England.

17th August 1952.

## APPENDIX 1

Seventeen generic names in the Class Aves discussed but not settled in "Opinion" 16, now proposed to be added to the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology"

- Caprimulgus** Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) **1** : 193 (gender of generic name : masculine) (type species, by Linnean tautonymy : *Caprimulgus europaeus* Linnaeus, 1758, *ibid.* **1** : 193).
- Certhia** Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) **1** : 118 (gender of generic name : feminine) (type species, by Linnean tautonymy : *Certhia familiaris* Linnaeus, 1758, *ibid.* **1** : 118).
- Corvus** Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) **1** : 105 (gender of generic name : masculine) (type species, by Linnean tautonymy : *Corvus corax* Linnaeus, 1758, *ibid.* **1** : 105).
- Cuculus** Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) **1** : 110 (gender of generic name : masculine) (type species, by Linnean tautonymy : *Cuculus canorus* Linnaeus, 1758, *ibid.* **1** : 110).
- Fringilla** Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) **1** : 179 (gender of generic name : feminine) (type species, by Linnean tautonymy : *Fringilla coelebs* Linnaeus, 1758, *ibid.* **1** : 179).
- Fulica** Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) **1** : 152 (gender of generic name : feminine) (type species, by Linnean tautonymy : *Fulica atra* Linnaeus, 1758, *ibid.* **1** : 152).
- Loxia** Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) **1** : 171 (gender of generic name : feminine) (type species, by Linnean tautonymy : *Loxia curvirostra* Linnaeus, 1758, *ibid.* **1** : 171).
- Meleagris** Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) **1** : 156 (gender of generic name : feminine) (type species, by Linnean tautonymy : *Meleagris gallopavo* Linnaeus, 1758, *ibid.* **1** : 156).
- Merops** Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) **1** : 117 (gender of generic name : masculine) (type species, by Linnean tautonymy : *Merops apiaster* Linnaeus, 1758, *ibid.* **1** : 117).
- Motacilla** Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) **1** : 184 (gender of generic name : feminine) (type species by Linnean tautonymy : *Motacilla alba* Linnaeus, 1758, *ibid.* **1** : 185).
- Pavo** Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) **1** : 156 (gender of generic name : masculine) (type species, by Linnean tautonymy : *Pavo cristatus* Linnaeus, 1758, *ibid.* **1** : 156).
- Pelecanus** Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) **1** : 132 (gender of generic name : masculine) (type species, by Linnean tautonymy : *Pelecanus onocrotalus* Linnaeus, 1758, *ibid.* **1** : 132).
- Phasianus** Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) **1** : 158 (gender of generic name : masculine) (type species, by Linnean tautonymy : *Phasianus colchicus* Linnaeus, 1758, *ibid.* **1** : 158).



**Scolopax** Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) **1** : 145 (gender of generic name : feminine) (type species, by Linnean tautonymy : *Scolopax rusticola* Linnaeus, 1758, *ibid.* **1** : 146).

**Sterna** Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) **1** : 137 (gender of generic name : feminine) (type species, by Linnean tautonymy : *Sterna hirundo* Linnaeus, 1758, *ibid.* **1** : 137).

**Tringa** Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) **1** : 148 (gender of generic name : feminine) (type species, by Linnean tautonymy : *Tringa ochropus* (emend. of *ocrophus*) Linnaeus, 1758, *ibid.* **1** : 149)\*.

**Upupa** Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) **1** : 117 (gender of generic name : feminine) (type species, by Linnean tautonymy : *Upupa epops* Linnaeus, 1758, *ibid.* **1** : 117).

## APPENDIX 2

**Seventeen specific trivial names, being the trivial names of the type species of the nominal genera enumerated in Appendix 1, now proposed to be added to the "Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology"**

**alba** Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) **1** : 185 (as published in the combination *Motacilla alba*) (trivial name of type species of *Motacilla* Linnaeus, 1758).

**apiaster** Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) **1** : 117 (as published in the combination *Merops apiaster*) (trivial name of type species of *Merops* Linnaeus, 1758).

**atra** Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) **1** : 152 (as published in the combination *Fulica atra*) (trivial name of type species of *Fulica* Linnaeus, 1758).

**canorus** Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) **1** : 110 (as published in the combination *Cuculus canorus*) (trivial name of type species of *Cuculus* Linnaeus, 1758).

**coelebs** Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) **1** : 179 (as published in the combination *Fringilla coelebs*) (trivial name of type species of *Fringilla* Linnaeus, 1758).

**colchicus** Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) **1** : 158 (as published in the combination *Phasianus colchicus*) (trivial name of type species of *Phasianus* Linnaeus, 1758).

**corax** Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) **1** : 105 (as published in the combination *Corvus corax*) (trivial name of type species of *Corvus* Linnaeus, 1758).

---

\*For the reason why it is here suggested that the emended form of the trivial name of the type species of this genus should be accepted, see Note to Appendix 2.

**cristatus** Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) **1** : 156 (as published in the combination *Pavo cristatus*) (trivial name of type species of *Pavo* Linnaeus, 1758).

**curvirostra** Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) **1** : 171 (as published in the combination *Loxia curvirostra*) (trivial name of type species of *Loxia* Linnaeus, 1758).

**epops** Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) **1** : 117 (as published in the combination *Upupa epops*) (trivial name of type species of *Upupa* Linnaeus, 1758).

**europaeus** Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) **1** : 193 (as published in the combination *Caprimulgus europaeus*) (trivial name of type species of *Caprimulgus* Linnaeus, 1758).

**familiaris** Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) **1** : 118 (as published in the combination *Certhia familiaris*) (trivial name of type species of *Certhia* Linnaeus, 1758).

**gallopavo** Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) **1** : 156 (as published in the combination *Meleagris gallopavo*) (trivial name of type species of *Meleagris* Linnaeus, 1758).

**hirundo** Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) **1** : 137 (as published in the combination *Sterna hirundo*) (trivial name of type species of *Sterna* Linnaeus, 1758).

**ochropus** (emend. of *ocrophus*) Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) **1** : 149 (as published in the combination *Tringa ocrophus*) (trivial name of type species of *Tringa* Linnaeus, 1758).

**onocrotalus** Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) **1** : 132 (as published in the combination *Pelecanus onocrotalus*) (trivial name of type species of *Pelecanus* Linnaeus, 1758).

**rusticola** Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) **1** : 146 (as published in the combination *Scolopax rusticola*) (trivial name of type species of *Scolopax* Linnaeus, 1758).

NOTE.—Attention is drawn to the fact that in the foregoing list the form in which it is suggested that the trivial name of the type species of *Tringa* Linnaeus, 1758, should be added to the *Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology* is “ochropus” and not “ocrophus,” the spelling employed by Linnaeus in 1758. Linnaeus evidently had no fixed ideas as to how this word should be spelt, for (as pointed out by Witherby, 1940, *Handbook Brit. Birds* **4** : 310) Linnaeus used the spelling “ocropus” in the Twelfth Edition of the *Syst. Nat.* In 1758 Linnaeus made it clear that, in applying this name to the Green Sandpiper, he was doing no more than copying it from Gesner (510, 511), reference to whose work shows that Linnaeus made an error in copying from Gesner (or the printer misread Linnaeus’ manuscript), for the spelling used by Gesner was “ochropus,” the currently accepted emendation of the incorrect version “ocrophus” of the 10th edition of the *Systema Naturae*. Since the foregoing conclusion was reached, the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature of the International Ornithological Congress has submitted to the International Commission an application (Z.N.(S.)491) for the emendation under Article 19 of the trivial names of three species of bird, one of which is the name discussed above. (See page 52 of the present volume.)

TYPE SPECIES OF CERTAIN GENERA OF BIRDS, DISCUSSED, BUT LEFT UNSETTLED, IN "OPINION" 16:  
SUPPORT FOR PROPOSALS SUBMITTED IN THE  
SECRETARY'S REPORT

By RICHARD MEINERTZHAGEN, D.S.O.

(London)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)274)

(Letter dated 20th August, 1952)

Thank you for your letter of 18th August enclosing a copy of your Report to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature on the question of the species to be accepted as the type species of the genera of birds which were discussed in the Commission's *Opinion* 16 but on which no decision was then taken.

I am very much in favour of decisions being taken by the Commission in regard to these generic names, for the present position is very unsatisfactory, there being at present no method by which to ascertain with certainty whether the type species of these genera were determined by Linnean tautonymy under the ruling given in *Opinion* 16. I therefore welcome the proposal that the seventeen generic names set out in your Report, where it is clear that the type species of the genera concerned were settled in this way and where the species so indicated are those which are currently as being the type species of the genera in question, should now be placed on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*. The position as regards the five other generic names will, as you say, need to be considered further in greater detail.

I see that in the case of the genus *Tringa* Linnaeus, 1758, you propose that the trivial name of the type species should be placed on the *Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology* in the form of the long-established emendation "ochropus" in place of the incorrect spelling "ocrophus" used by Linnaeus in 1758. This proposal is certainly right, for any other course would lead to pointless name-changing and would serve no useful purpose. Moreover, as is clear, Linnaeus himself would have used the emended spelling if it had not been for the fact that he made an error of copying when he took this word over from Gesner. As you know, this trivial name is one of the three such names, recognition of the emendations made for which has been asked for in the application Z.N.(S.)491, which the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature has submitted to the International Commission.



PROPOSED ADDITION TO THE "OFFICIAL LIST OF  
SPECIFIC TRIVIAL NAMES IN ZOOLOGY" OF THE  
TRIVIAL NAMES OF TWO SIBERIAN BIRDS

By the late JAMES L. PETERS

(Museum of Comparative Zoology at Harvard College, Cambridge, Mass., U.S.A.)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)496)

The present application to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is concerned with the question of the trivial names properly applicable to two species of lark, each of which was originally described from Siberian material. The names and relevant synonyms of these species are as follows:—

**Species "A"**

*Alda yeltonensis* Forster, 1767, *Phil. Trans.* **57** (2) : 350.

*Tanagra sibirica* Sparrman, 1786, *Mus. carlson.* (1) : No. xix (et fig.).

**Species "B"**

*Alda sibirica* Gmelin, 1789, in Linnaeus, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 13) **1** (2) : 799.

*Alda leucoptera* Pallas, 1811, *Zoogr. rosso-asiat.* **1** : 518, pl. 33.

2. The two species are considered to be congeneric, both being referred to the genus *Melanocorypha* Boie, 1828 (*Isis* (Oken) **1828** : 322). For many years the first of these species was known as *Melanocorypha yeltonensis* (Forster) and the second as *Melanocorypha sibirica* (Gmelin). About twenty years ago, however, Hartert & Steinbacher (1932, *Vög. pal. Fauna*, *Ergänzungsband* (1) : 103) discarded the trivial name *sibirica* Gmelin for species "B," on the ground that it was a secondary homonym of the trivial name *sibirica* Sparrman, 1786, which, as shown above, is a junior synonym of *yeltonensis* Forster, 1767, the oldest available name for species "A." These authors thereupon applied the trivial name *leucoptera* Pallas, 1811, to species "B." Most recent authors have followed Hartert & Steinbacher in this matter and have used the trivial name *leucoptera* Pallas for species "B."

3. Doubts have been expressed as to the correctness of the action of these authors in rejecting the name *sibirica* Gmelin, having regard to the fact that the spelling of this name is not identical with that of the name (*sibirica* Sparrman) for which it was rejected on the ground of secondary homonymy. In this connection it was pointed out, in particular, that the differences in spelling between these two names are not among the differences which the third paragraph of Article 35 prescribes are to be ignored in determining whether any given pair of trivial names are to be treated as being homonyms of one another.

4. If the considerations set forth above alone were relevant to this matter, the argument advanced above would be unanswerable, and there could be no doubt that, under the Rules, the practice of the last twenty years should be reversed and that species "B" should in future be known by the trivial name *sibirica* (Gmelin).

5. The foregoing argument does not however cover the whole of the field in a case of this kind, for it ignores the fact that, where we are concerned with two trivial names, each based upon the name of the same locality and differing from one another only in some small respect of spelling, the difference may be due to an error of orthography or of transcription or to a printers' error and therefore that Article 19 may apply to one of the names in question. In such a case the effect of applying Article 19 may be to make the two names identical with one another and thus to make them homonyms of one another. This clearly was a possibility which it was necessary to examine, for although I should not consider the present case of sufficient importance to justify the use by the Commission of its plenary powers for the sake of preserving the practice which has grown up since the publication of the volume by Hartert & Steinbacher (1932), it is equally important to avoid any action which would disturb that practice unless it was clear that this was necessary under a strict application of the Rules.

6. At this stage therefore I consulted my colleague, Mr. Francis Hemming, Secretary to the Commission, who has furnished to me the following Report (*in litt*, 6th May 1951):—

In approaching the question whether trivial names such as *sibirica* and *siberica* should, or should not, be treated as homonyms of one another, one cannot fail to be impressed by the fact that the late Charles D. Sherborn, the most learned bibliographer of his time, treated names spelt "*siberica*" as misspellings for "*sibirica*," listing both together under the latter spelling (1902, *Index Anim.*, Pars prima: 900). Although in the present case there was a strong presumption from the type localities of the two larks in question that the trivial names applied to these species by Sparman (1786) and Gmelin (1789) respectively were each intended to indicate the same locality and therefore that the difference in spelling between the two names did not indicate a difference in meaning, being a matter of orthography only, it seemed to me, on receiving your inquiry, that the first step to be taken should be to investigate the question of the meaning attaching to these words. I accordingly applied for advice to Professor Charles Singer, Professor Emeritus of the History of Science in the University of London, than whom, in my opinion, no more authoritative adviser could be found on a question of this kind. Professor Singer kindly undertook to consider this question and in due course furnished the following report: "The correct form of the adjective is undoubtedly 'sibir-' not 'siber-.' Sibir was the name of a Tabar fort on the Irtysh which was captured by Cossacks in 1581. The name 'Siberia' was extended in the seventeenth century to the Muscovite dominions in the North-East. Thus, 'sibirica' is the proper adjective."

In view of Professor Singer's Report, it is clear that there was at no time any place named "Siber," as contrasted with the Tabar fort named "Sibir" and that, in view of the extension during the seventeenth century of the meaning attaching to the word "Siberia" (and thus, to the adjective "*sibirica*"), it must certainly be concluded that, where (as here) two species occurring in the portion of the Muscovite dominions known, in English, as "Siberia" are named respectively "*sibirica*" and "*siberica*," that difference in spelling is not due to any difference in the origin or meaning of the two trivial names in question but is attributable solely to difference in orthography. In the present case, Professor Singer has shown conclusively that the correct way of spelling the adjective in question is "*sibirica*" and not "*siberica*," thus endorsing the conclusion reached in this matter by Sherborn nearly fifty years ago, a conclusion which, it may be noted, no one in the intervening period has ever tried to dispute.

The problem with which we are confronted here has therefore nothing to do with the question whether these two larks have the same word as their trivial name: it is quite clear that they have. The question to be considered is whether the difference in spelling adopted for these two names is a legitimate difference (in which case the two names would not be homonyms of one another) or, being due to error of spelling in the case of one of the names, is an illegitimate difference and one which calls for action under Article 19. In my view, the information furnished by Professor Singer, taken in conjunction with the considerations advanced above, would make it quite impossible to sustain an argument that there is a legitimate difference between the correctly spelt adjective "*sibirica*" and the incorrectly spelt adjective "*siberica*." I conclude, therefore that, under the Rules, it is necessary to emend the defectively spelt trivial name "*siberica*" under Article 19, to "*sibirica*" before any consideration is given to the question of the relative status, for the purposes of the Law of Homonymy, of the trivial names published respectively by Sparrman and Gmelin. Once the necessary emendation of Sparrman's faultily spelt trivial name is made, we find that the name so emended is identical with the name later published by Gmelin.

It is evident therefore that Hartert & Steinbacher were perfectly correct when in 1932 they rejected the trivial name *sibirica* Gmelin, 1789, as being, within the genus *Melanocorypha* Boie, a junior secondary homonym of the trivial name *sibirica* (emend. of *siberica*) Sparrman, 1787. A name once validly rejected in this way as a junior secondary homonym cannot, as we know, ever again be used for the species to which it was originally given. Accordingly, ever since the publication in 1932 of Hartert's and Steinbacher's volume, the trivial name *sibirica* Gmelin has been a dead homonym, incapable in any circumstances of being brought back to life again. Since, as those authors pointed out—and as you confirm—the next name to be given to the species to which in 1789 Gmelin gave the invalid name *Alauda sibirica* was the name *Alauda leucoptera* Pallas, 1811, it follows that the oldest available trivial name, and therefore the valid trivial name for the species in question is *leucoptera* Pallas, the name by which that species is currently known.

7. In the circumstances it is clear that it would not be in accordance with the Rules to resuscitate the trivial name *sibirica* Gmelin for the species which for the last twenty years has been known by the trivial name *leucoptera* Pallas. Now that the position in this matter is clearly established, it is desirable that, in order to prevent any subsequent argument on the subject, the oldest available trivial names for each of these larks should be placed on the *Official List*, the invalid trivial name *sibirica* Gmelin being at the same time placed on the *Official Index*. I accordingly ask the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature:—

- (1) to place the under-mentioned trivial names on the *Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology*;—

- (a) *yeltonensis* Forster, 1767 (as published in the binominal combination *Alauda yeltonensis*);

- (b) *leucoptera* Pallas, 1811 (as published in the binominal combination *Alauda leucoptera*);

- (2) to place the trivial name *sibirica* Gmelin, 1789 (as published in the binominal combination *Alauda sibirica*) (the trivial name of a rejected junior secondary homonym in the genus *Melanocorypha* Boie, 1828) on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Trivial Names in Zoology*.



**PROPOSED USE OF THE PLENARY POWERS TO SECURE  
THAT THE NAME "COLUMBA MIGRATORIA" LIN-  
NAEUS, 1766, SHALL BE THE OLDEST AVAILABLE NAME  
FOR THE PASSENGER PIGEON, THE TYPE SPECIES OF  
THE GENUS "ECTOPISTES" SWAINSON, 1827**

By FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E.

(Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature)

**(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)574)**

The subject matter of the present application came to notice in the course of the routine checking of the entries on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* in connection with the projected publication of the *Official List* in book form. It is concerned with the question of the name to be used for the Passenger Pigeon. This species, which is currently known by the name *Columba migratoria* Linnaeus, 1766 (*Syst. Nat.* (ed. 12) **1** (1) : 285) is the type species of the genus *Ectopistes* Swainson, 1827 (*Zool. J.* **3** (11) : 362), by subsequent selection by Swainson in 1837 (in Lardner's *Cabinet Cyclop.* **6** : 348—sometimes known by its sub-title *Nat. Hist. Classif. Birds* **2** : 348). The generic name *Ectopistes* Swainson, 1837, was placed on the *Official List* as Name No. 51 in the Commission's *Opinion* 67 (published in 1916, *Smithson Publ.* **2409** : 180).

**2.** When I checked this entry on the *Official List* against Peters' *Check-List of the Birds of the World*, I found the following footnote on page 83 of volume 3 published in 1937 :—

There can be no real doubt that Bangs (*Proc. Biol. Soc. Wash.*, **19**, 1906, 43–44) was entirely correct in disposing of the Linnean names, *Columba macroura*, *Columba migratoria* and *Columba marginata*, as he did. On the other hand, his proposed changes have never been accepted, and since there is also room for argument contrary to Bangs' reasoning, I feel that to depart from current usage would only cause needless confusion.

**3.** It was immediately apparent that, as the name *Ectopistes* Swainson, of which *Columba migratoria* is the type species had been placed on the *Official List*, this matter would need to be resubmitted to the Commission, for it would clearly be improper for the Commission to connive at the ignoring of the problem which had been raised by Bangs (1906, *Proc. biol. Soc. Wash.* **19** : 43–44). As a first step, I consulted Bangs' short paper to ascertain exactly what it was that he had said. His presentation of the issue is very succinct. It reads as follows :—

THE NAMES OF THE PASSENGER PIGEON AND MOURNING DOVE

To those naturalists who . . . use the twelfth edition of Linnaeus (1766) as the starting point of binomial nomenclature, the names of the Passenger Pigeon and the Mourning Dove are clear and offer no complications. Not so, however, to the Americans and others who start with the tenth edition (1758), for here Linnaeus unquestionably included both birds in the references under his *Columba macroura*.

The A.O.U. committee on nomenclature and American ornithologists generally have of late years used this name for the Mourning Dove, and have called the Passenger Pigeon by the name that first appeared in the twelfth edition—*Columba migratoria* Linn. In my opinion, however, this is hardly correct.

Linnaeus' *Columba macroura* was based on Edwards p. 15, t. 15, and Catesby p. 23, t. 23. Edwards' bird, carefully described and well figured, was, of course, a Mourning Dove, but it came from the West Indies, and Edwards tells us, "The Figure of this bird shows it of its natural Bigness." Measuring the various parts and comparing the results with specimens, I find it altogether too small for the continental form of the Mourning Dove, and to agree very well with the small form of Cuba (and other islands of the Greater Antilles ?), which has been lately named *Zenaidura macroura bella* by Palmer and Riley. The reference to Catesby applies wholly to the Passenger Pigeon and the plate shows a fine adult male.

Now as all Linnaeus' references were given chronologically it matters not which came first, and the important question is from which of these two distinct species, confused under one name, did Linnaeus take his brief diagnosis and his "Habitat". In this instance it is plain. Linnaeus' diagnosis reads "pectore purpurascens", and he also says "Habitat, in Canada: hybernat in Carolina", both directly from Catesby and neither having anything whatever to do with Edwards.

In the twelfth edition Linnaeus dropped *Columba macroura*, called the Passenger Pigeon *Columba migratoria*, the Carolina Mourning Dove *Columba carolinensis*, and named the bird of Edwards' plate No. 15 *Columba marginata*.

It is therefore my opinion that we who stand by the tenth edition must arrange the names of these Columbæ as follows:—

**Ectopistes macrourus (Linn.)**

Passenger Pigeon

*Columba macroura* Linn., S.N. ed. 10, p. 164, 1758.

**Zenaidura carolinensis carolinensis (Linn.)**

Carolina Mourning Dove

*Columba carolinensis* Linn., S.N. ed. 12, p. 286, 1766.

**Zenaidura carolinensis marginata (Linn.)\***

West Indian Mourning Dove

*Columba marginata* Linn., S.N. ed. 12, p. 286, 1766.

4. My next step was to write as follows (on 14th October 1945) to my colleague, Dr. James L. Peters:—

*Ectopistes* Swainson, 1827: The type species of this genus is *Columba migratoria* Linnaeus, 1766, that species having been so selected by Swainson in 1837. Inspired by your footnote on page 83 of volume 3 of your *Check-List*, I have read Bangs' note in volume 19 of the *Proc. biol. Soc. Wash.* Naturally, I cannot express any opinion on the validity of his contentions but, as you state that: "There can be no real doubt" that he "was entirely correct in disposing of the Linnean names, *Columba macroura*, *Columba migratoria* and *Columba marginata*, as he did", I feel that the Commission can no longer leave things as they are, since to do so would be to cite in the *Official List* an incorrectly named species as the type species of the genus *Ectopistes* Swainson, 1827. It seems to me that the only way of avoiding the "needless confusion" referred to in your footnote, while at the same time avoiding an ostrich-like attitude of pretending not to see what

---

\*As to this latter name's supplanting *Zenaidura carolinensis bella* (Palmer & Riley) I cannot help feeling regret that a good modern name founded on a bird from a definite region should give way to an old one without definite type locality. But I can see no help for it. Edwards distinctly says his bird was from the West Indies, and figures a very small example, and as the small size of the Cuban Mourning Dove is about its only distinctive character, I am afraid the *Columba marginata* Linn. must be the name by which it shall be known.

is the matter would be for the Commission to use its plenary powers (1) to declare that *Columba migratoria* Linnaeus, 1766, is the name to be used for the Passenger Pigeon, and (ii) to declare that the name *Columba macroura* Linnaeus, 1758, is the name to be used for the race of the Carolina Mourning Dove from the Greater Antilles. Such action would be in strict accord with Article 3 of the Plenary Powers Resolution (*Declaration 5*), which states that the prevention of the transference from one unit to another of generic and specific names is one of the particular objects of the Congress in granting the Commission these exceptional powers. I shall be grateful for your views on this question, since some action will certainly have to be taken in view of the fact that *Ectopistes* Swainson is on the *Official List*.

5. In his reply (dated 6th December 1945) Dr. Peters wrote as follows :—

*Ectopistes* Swainson, 1827 : As long as Bangs' suggestion has not been generally accepted, there is no confusion at present concerning the names of the Passenger Pigeon and the Mourning Dove. The suggestion was made 39 years ago and in the passage of time Bangs' proposal has more or less receded into the background and the commonly accepted identity of the two Linnean species involved has become more firmly fixed. There is, however, always the danger that the case will be resurrected and I feel, as you do, that the Commission would do well definitely to use its Plenary Powers and settle the matter for all time.

6. Ever since the correspondence quoted above, I have intended to take the first convenient opportunity for laying the present case before the Commission. Such an opportunity has now arisen through the presentation to the Commission by the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature of a large number of applications relating to the names of birds. Before doing so, I have laid the draft of the present paper before Colonel Richard Meinertzhagen, the Chairman of the Standing Committee. Colonel Meinertzhagen has informed me (*in litt.*, 29th August 1952) that he considers that it is important that the Commission should now settle without further delay this long-outstanding question and that he is in agreement with the solution recommended in the present application.

7. Before I set out the action recommended, it will, I think, be repaying briefly to examine what Linnaeus wrote about his nominal species *Columba macroura* when in 1758 (: 164) he first published that name. It is extremely brief and reads as follows :—

#### **Columba**

macoura 16. C. cauda cuneiformi longa, pectore purpurascente

*Columba macroura*. *Edw. av.* 15 t. 15.

*Palumbus migratorius*. *Catesb. car.* 1 p. 23 t. 23.

*Habitat in Canada; hybernates in Carolina.*

8. As in many Linnean descriptions there is nothing in the description given by Linnaeus for *Columba macroura* to show, or even to suggest, that he had ever had before him a specimen of the species to which he applied this name or was doing more than giving a name to the birds figured by Edwards and Catesby respectively, which he erroneously supposed were conspecific with one another. Thus, it is quite possible that there never was a type specimen of this nominal species. Whether there was or not, no such specimen is now extant and the only means of identifying the taxonomic species represented by this nominal species is through the two figures which Linnaeus cited. Of these figures, it is agreed by ornithologists that the figure given by Edwards represents the



Mourning Dove and that by Catesby the Passenger Pigeon. Thus, the nominal species *Columba macroura* Linnaeus may be looked upon as having been initially a composite species. According to this view, the trivial name *macroura* Linnaeus would adhere to whichever of the two included species was first definitely so selected under the provisions of Article 31. Until 1948 this Article was so lacking in precision that it is often a matter of opinion whether action by a particular author on a particular date can properly be regarded as a selection made under this Article. In the present instance Bangs quite definitely made such a selection by specifying Catesby's plate 23 as the figure by which the nominal species *Columba macroura* should be identified, thus making Catesby's plate the representative of a lectotype for this species (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 74-76). This is not to say, however, that no ornithologist at an earlier date had not made a valid selection of Edwards' plate 15 to represent the lectotype, though the fact that no evidence of any such prior selection has, so far as I am aware, been brought forward for the purpose of rebutting Bangs' contention suggests at least that it is unlikely that any such selection is known to have been made. The present case is complicated, however, by the existence of another consideration which does not seem to have been advanced in express terms. This consideration arises from the fact that both the authors (Edwards and Catesby) cited by Linnaeus, though pre-1758 authors, nevertheless by accident applied binominal names to the birds which they figured and that the name used by Edwards was *Columba macroura* and was thus an absolute tautonym of the name selected by Linnaeus for his nominal species. It might therefore be argued that on this account Linnaeus should be treated as having himself "indicated" by absolute tautonymy that he regarded Edwards' bird as being (or his figure as representing) the type specimen of this nominal species, to the exclusion of Catesby's bird, notwithstanding the fact that he took part of his description and the whole of his "Habitat" from Catesby and not from Edwards.

9. It therefore seems legitimate to conclude that in this case (as in the case of the names of many other composite nominal species established long before the introduction of the *Règles*) it is a matter of real difficulty to determine under Article 31 to which of the included taxonomic species the trivial name *macroura* Linnaeus is properly applicable under the *Règles*. Nothing therefore but a ruling by the Commission could provide a definite settlement of the present case. In a case such as the present where on balance it seems likely that the result desired is the reverse of that which would result from a strict application of the ordinary provisions of the *Règles*, the only certain method of securing that solution is by the use by the Commission of its plenary powers. This is the procedure recommended by the late Dr. Peters and is also recommended by Colonel Meineitzhagen. This therefore is the recommendation which I now put forward for consideration.

10. The specific proposals now submitted are that the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature should :—

- (1) use its plenary powers to designate the description given on page 15, and the figure given on plate 15 by Edwards (G.), *Nat. Hist. Birds*, for the species which that author called *Columba macroura* to represent the lectotype of the nominal species *Columba macroura*

Linnaeus, 1758, the type locality thus to become that cited by Edwards, namely the "West Indies";

- (2) place the under-mentioned trivial names on the *Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology* :—

(a) *macroura* Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the combination *Columba macroura*), as proposed, under (1) above, to be defined under the plenary powers ;

(b) *migratoria* Linnaeus, 1766 (as published in the combination *Columba migratoria*) (trivial name of type species of *Ectopistes* Swainson, 1827) ;

(c) *carolinensis* Linnaeus, 1766 (as published in the combination *Columba carolinensis*) :

- (3) place on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Trivial Names in Zoology* the trivial name *marginata* Linnaeus, 1766 (as published in the combination *Columba marginata*) (a name which, being based upon Edwards' plate 15, is an objective junior synonym of the trivial name *macroura* Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the combination *Columba macroura*), as proposed, under (1) above, to be defined under the plenary powers).

**PROPOSED CORRECTION IN THE "OFFICIAL LIST OF  
GENERIC NAMES IN ZOOLOGY" OF INCORRECT DATES  
AND BIBLIOGRAPHICAL REFERENCES GIVEN FOR THE  
GENERIC NAME "BALAENICEPS" GOULD, 1850, AND  
FOR THE NAME OF ITS TYPE SPECIES (CLASS AVES)  
(CORRECTION OF AN ERROR IN "OPINION" 67)**

By FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E.

(Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)590)

1. The purpose of the present application is to draw attention to, and to propose the correction of, an erroneous entry in the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* in regard to the dates of publication of, and bibliographical references for, the generic name *Balaeniceps* Gould, 1850, and its type species (Class Aves), made in *Opinion* 67 (1916, *Smithson. Publ.* **2409**: 179). The error in question was detected in the course of routine checking in connection with the preparation of the *Official List* for publication in book form.

2. The generic name *Balaeniceps* and the name of its type species (by monotypy), *Balaeniceps rex*, is commonly treated as having been first published in the volume of the *Proceedings of the Zoological Society of London* for the year 1852. It was on this basis that the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature was asked to place—and did place—the generic name *Balaeniceps* Gould on the *Official List*. The entry in *Opinion* 67 under which this name was placed on the *Official List* reads as follows: "*Balaeniceps* Gould, Proc. Zool. Soc. Lond. 1852, i. Mt., *B. rex* Gould."

3. Before passing to the principal error involved, it must be noted (1)—that the volume of the *Proc. zool. Soc. Lond.* referred to above is numbered "19" and should be so cited, (2) that the page on which the name *Balaeniceps* first appeared was numbered "1" (as an Arabic numeral) not "i" (small Roman numeral), (3) that volume 19 was published in Parts over a period extending from October, 1852, to June, 1854, and therefore that the date of publication should be cited in square brackets. The correct citation of the foregoing publication of the name with which we are here concerned is therefore: *Balaeniceps* Gould, [1852], *Proc. zool. Soc. Lond.* **19** (1): 1.

4. But the above is not the first occasion on which the names *Balaeniceps* Gould and *Balaeniceps rex* Gould were published, for as pointed out by Neave (1939, *Nomencl. zool.* **1**: 386) the generic name *Balaeniceps* Gould was first published in 1850 on page 1315 of the volume for that year of the serial publication *Athenaeum*. Reference to the page in the *Athenaeum* quoted shows that on it there is a brief description of Gould's genus *Balaeniceps* and his species *Balaeniceps rex*. Accordingly both these names must in future be treated as having been first published in 1850 and not in 1852 and in the volume



of the *Athenaeum* for 1850 and not in volume 19 of the *Proc. zool. Soc. Lond.* The genus *Balaeniceps* Rex, 1850, was monotypical with the above species as type species, just as was also the genus *Balaeniceps* Gould, [1852].

5. It is proposed to incorporate the foregoing correction in the *Official List*.

**SUGGESTED REVIEW OF THE ENTRIES ON THE  
"OFFICIAL LIST OF GENERIC NAMES IN ZOOLOGY"  
OF THE ENTRIES RELATING TO THE NAMES "OEDIC-  
NEMUS" TEMMINCK, 1815, AND "BURHINUS" ILLIGER,  
1811 (CLASS AVES)**

By FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E.

(Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature)

**(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)591)**

In the course of the routine checking of the entries made in the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* undertaken as part of the preparations for the publication of the first instalment of the *Official List* in book-form, I encountered an anomaly in regard to the names of two genera in the Class Aves, which calls for further consideration by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature. The facts of this case are accordingly now laid before the Commission for decision.

2. The names with which the present application is concerned were both placed on the *Official List* in *Opinion* 67 (1916, *Smithson. Publ.* 2409 : 175-182). The names in question are :—

- (1) *Burhinus* Illiger, 1811, *Prodr. Syst. Mamm. Avium* : 250 (type species, by monotypy : *Charadrius magnirostris* Latham, 1801, *Index ornith. Suppl.* : lxvi) (Name No. 30)
- (2) *Oedicnemus* Temminck, 1815, *Manuel Ornith.* : 321 (type species, by monotypy : *Oedicnemus crepitans* Temminck, 1815, *Manuel Ornith.* : 322 (stated in *Opinion* 67 to be the same species as *Charadrius oedicnemus* Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) 1 : 151) (Name No. 76).

3. Both the above names are available names in the sense that neither (1) is a junior homonym of an older generic name consisting of the same word nor (2) has, as its type species, a species which is also the type species of another nominal genus of older date.

4. The difficulty which arises in the present case is of a taxonomic character, for, according to Peters (J. L.) (1934, *Check-List Birds World* 2: 293-297) the taxonomic species represented by the nominal species *Oedicnemus crepitans* Temminck, 1815 (= *Charadrius oedicnemus* Linnaeus, 1758), the type species of *Oedicnemus* Temminck, 1815, is congeneric with the taxonomic species represented by the nominal species *Charadrius magnirostris* Latham, 1801, the type species of the genus *Burhinus* Illiger, 1811. According to this taxonomic view, the nominal genera *Oedicnemus* Temminck, 1815, and *Burhinus* Illiger, 1811, are subjectively identical with one another, and the name *Oedicnemus* Temminck, 1815, is a junior subjective synonym of the name *Burhinus* Illiger, 1811.

5. The purpose of the *Official List* is to give formal official recognition to generic names which are not only nomenclatorially available names but are also, in the opinion of specialists in the group concerned, the names of taxonomically valid genera. It is quite inappropriate that a name that is universally regarded by specialists as a subjective junior synonym of another name should find a place on the *Official List*. Clearly, therefore, any such name which by an oversight has been placed on the *Official List* should be removed therefrom. Accordingly, the name *Oedicnemus* Temminck, 1815, should now be removed from the *Official List*, if ornithologists generally are agreed that the nominal genera *Oedicnemus* Temminck, 1815, and *Burhinus* Illiger, 1811, as defined by their respective type species, are taxonomically identical with one another. If, however, specialists were not agreed on this subject, some recognising the genus *Oedicnemus* Temminck as the name of a taxonomically valid genus in addition to so recognising the name *Burhinus* Illiger, the most suitable solution would be to leave the name *Oedicnemus* Temminck on the *Official List*, but to add to the entry relating to that name a note stating that this name has been placed on the *Official List* for use by specialists who may consider that the type species of this genus is generically distinct from the type species of the genus *Burhinus* Illiger. It will be recalled that a procedure of this kind was deliberately adopted by the International Commission in *Opinion* 104, when dealing with the names of the genera published for the human malaria parasites (the generic name *Laverania* being then placed on the *Official List* with a note of the kind indicated above, in addition to the older name *Plasmodium* Marchiafava & Celli, 1885), and that the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology expressly enjoined the International Commission to follow this course when considering the addition to the *Official List* of names which were available and well known but not accepted by all specialists as being taxonomically required (1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 4: 237). It will be appreciated that this procedure serves the twofold purpose of stabilising well-known names, without, in cases where specialists are divided on the question of the taxonomic status of allied nominal genera, involving the International Commission in expressing or implying (through the *Official List*) any view on the taxonomic issue involved.

6. The International Ornithological Congress at its meeting held at Uppsala in 1950 appointed a Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature to co-operate with the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, on questions affecting the names of birds; it appeared to me, therefore, that it would be helpful to seek the views of the Standing Committee on the question whether the name *Oedinenus* Temminck, 1815, should be removed from the *Official List* or alternatively whether it should be retained thereon, subject to the addition of a note that this name had been placed on the *List* for use only by authors who considered that the taxonomic species represented by the nominal species *Oedinenus crepitans* Temminck, 1815, was generically distinct from that represented by *Charadrius magnirostris* Latham, 1801, the type species of *Burhinus* Illiger, 1811. I accordingly asked Colonel Richard Meinertzhagen, Chairman of the Standing Committee, if he would be so good as to obtain the views of his Committee on the relative merits of the alternative courses set out above. Colonel Meinertzhagen kindly consented to put this matter to the Standing Committee and on 2nd September, 1951, wrote me the following letter: "I have consulted the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature on the names *Oedinenus* and *Burhinus* with reference to the *Official List*. M. Berlioz has not replied, but I am taking a majority vote by which we are agreed that *Oedinenus* Temminck, 1815, should be sunk to *Burhinus* Illiger, 1811, the respective type species being congeneric."

7. In view of the consensus of opinion regarding the relative status of the two nominal genera concerned and of the recommendation received from the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature, I submit, for consideration, the proposal that the name *Oedinenus* Temminck, 1815, should now be removed from the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*.



**PROPOSED USE OF THE PLENARY POWERS TO SUPPRESS FOUR GENERIC NAMES FOR BIRDS PUBLISHED BY BRISSON IN 1760 WHICH HAVE LONG BEEN OVERLOOKED AND WHICH INVALIDATE AS HOMONYMS FOUR NAMES PLACED ON THE "OFFICIAL LIST OF GENERIC NAMES IN ZOOLOGY" (CORRECTION OF ERRONEOUS ENTRIES IN "OPINION" 67)**

By FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E.

(Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature)

**(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)701)**

The purpose of the present application is to ask the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to use its plenary powers to validate four generic names placed on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* by the Commission's *Opinion* 67 (1916, *Smithson. Publ.* **2409** : 177-182), each of which it is now seen is an invalid junior homonym of a generic name consisting of the same word published by M. J. Brisson in 1760 in his *Ornithologie* but since then completely overlooked.

2. The position in regard to this matter is as follows: (1) Brisson was a non-binominal author of what was formerly called the "binary" school, that is, he recognised that the scientific name of an animal must be designed to denote two concepts, namely that represented by the species to which the name was applied and that represented by the next higher group (i.e. the genus) in which that species was placed, and that the generic concept must be denoted by a noun substantive in the nominative singular placed at the beginning of the name, but who did not consider it necessary that the species concept should also be denoted by a single word, regarding it as equally appropriate that this concept should be denoted by a phrase consisting of two or more Latin words. (2) In 1911, at a time when the International Commission considered that generic names published by authors who applied a "binary," though non-binominal system of nomenclature satisfied the requirements of Article 25 of the *Règles*, the Commission published an *Opinion*, *Opinion* 37 (1911, *Smithson. Publ.* **2013** : 87-88), in which it ruled that the generic names in Brisson's *Ornithologie* satisfied the requirements of the Rules. (3) In 1948 (1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 65) the International Congress of Zoology substituted the word "binominal" for the word "binary" in Article 25, thereby making it clear that names published by non-binominal "binary" authors possessed no availability in nomenclature. (4) The foregoing decision would have destroyed the availability of all the generic names in Brisson's *Ornithologie*, if it had not been decided to accompany it with a further provision expressly preserving the status previously accorded to those names under its *Opinion* 37 of 1911 (1950, *ibid.* **4** : 65, Point (3) (a) (iv)). It will be seen from the foregoing particulars that, other things being equal, every new generic name in Brisson's *Ornithologie* of 1760 is an available name.

3. The recent discovery that Brisson had published a generic name *Gavia* in the *Ornithologie* (see application Z.N.(S.)78, relating to the name *Colymbus*

Linnaeus, 1758\*) which had been completely overlooked in all zoological Nomenclators led me to think that it was desirable to make a thorough examination of Brisson's *Ornithologie*, in order to make sure that none of the generic names for birds which had been placed on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* was preoccupied by generic names consisting of identical words published in 1760 in Brisson's *Ornithologie* but since overlooked. I have accordingly examined the *Ornithologie* from this point of view, as the result of which it now appears that six generic names now on the *Official List* are invalid (because junior) homonyms of names published by Brisson in 1760. Of the names so found to be invalid, the following five were placed on the *Official List* in *Opinion* 67: (1) *Bubo* Duméril, 1806; (2) *Coturnix* Bonnaterrre, 1790; (3) *Egretta* Forster, 1817; (4) *Gallinago* Koch, 1816; (5) *Oriolus* Linnaeus, 1766. The sixth name on the *Official List* now found to be preoccupied by an identical Brisson name is *Grus* Pallas, 1767, which was placed on the *Official List* by *Opinion* 103 (*Smithson. misc. Coll.* **73** (No. 5): 21-24). Special problems arise in connection with two of these names, namely *Gallinago* Koch and *Grus* Pallas. The first of these cases is dealt with in Application Z.N.(S.) 575 (see pp. 93-95 of the present volume); the second in Application Z.N.(S.) 558, which is at present still under discussion with specialists but which will be published as soon as possible. The present application is accordingly concerned only with the position of the names *Bubo* Duméril, *Coturnix* Bonnaterrre, *Egretta* Forster, and *Oriolus* Linnaeus.

4. The decision to validate the names in Brisson's *Ornithologie* was taken with the sole purpose of promoting stability in ornithological nomenclature and it would certainly not have been taken in the form then adopted if it had been made clear to the Commission by ornithologists that certain only of the new generic names published by Brisson in 1760 were in general use and required protection, while others had long been ignored and, if validated, would cause disturbance and confusion rather than contribute to uniformity and stability. Now that the actual position has been brought to light, it seems to me that the most reasonable course would be for the Commission so to use its plenary powers as to secure its original intention. In other words, the most appropriate course seems to be to suppress those of the Brisson names which were—as it were, inadvertently—validated when the ruling of 1911 (in *Opinion* 37) was confirmed by the Commission in 1948 in those cases where the names, so validated, would, it is now seen, merely lead to confusion and objectionable name-changing. The number of new names which will need to be examined for this purpose is large, and in view of the consultations with specialists which will need to be undertaken, the investigation involved will necessarily occupy a considerable time. It is for this reason that the four names dealt with in the present application have been picked out for advance consideration, since, until decisions have been taken in regard to these names, the publication of the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* in book form will inevitably be held up.

5. I have consulted Colonel Richard Meinertzhagen, Chairman of the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature appointed in 1950 by the International Ornithological Congress (see pp. 4-5 of the present volume),

\*See page 11 of the present volume.

and he has sent me the following reply (*in litt.*, dated 10th September 1952): "Many of the generic names published by Brisson in 1760 in his *Ornithologie* are household words and it was therefore of the utmost importance that the Commission should provide a valid basis for these names. The action taken by the Commission in this sense in 1948 was therefore of the greatest value. In addition, however, to these names, there are many other new generic names in the *Ornithologie* which have been completely overlooked and which, if now resurrected, would lead to confusion and name-changing, without providing any compensating advantage. This risk will remain until all the new names in the *Ornithologie* have been carefully examined and those names which are in general use finally stabilised by being put on the *Official List*, all the other names concerned being at the same time suppressed. This task, which will be a big piece of work and will involve extensive consultations, will inevitably take a considerable time even in the most favourable circumstances. Pending the completion of this survey, all that the Commission can do is to take such action in individual cases as may be found to be necessary, for example, to suppress the name *Gavia* Brisson, as proposed in the application regarding the name *Colymbus* Linnaeus submitted by the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature. In the case of the four names (*Bubo*, *Coturnix*, *Egretta* and *Oriolus*) placed on the *Official List* by *Opinion* 67 but now found to be invalid, I consider that it is important that the position should be cleared up as quickly as possible by the suppression by the Commission of the four corresponding Brisson names which, though not in current use, technically invalidate these well-known generic names."

6. In the circumstances and in view of the advice received from Colonel Meinertzhagen, I now recommend that the Commission should validate the existing entries in the *Official List* by suppressing the Brisson names which invalidate the four names in question. It would be convenient if at the same time the Commission were to place on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names* one still earlier name consisting of the same word published in 1758 in Nozeman and Vosmaer's *Geslachten der Vogelen* (a Dutch translation of the work by Moehring entitled *Avium Genera* published—before the starting point of zoological nomenclature—in 1752), a work which the Commission has already ruled is unavailable for nomenclatorial purposes (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 566-568).

7. The specific action which the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is now asked to take is therefore that it should :—

- (1) use its plenary powers to suppress the under-mentioned generic names for the purposes both of the Law of Priority and of the Law of Homonymy :—

- (a) *Bubo* Brisson, 1760, *Ornithologie* **1** : 477-486 ;
- (b) *Coturnix* Brisson, 1760, *ibid.* **1** : 247-261 ;
- (c) *Egretta* Brisson, 1760, *ibid.* **5** : 431-433 ;
- (d) *Oriolus* Brisson, 1760, *ibid.* **2** : 320-333 ;



- (2) confirm in their position on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* the following names placed thereon by *Opinion* 67 :—

- (a) *Bubo* Duméril, 1806 ;
- (b) *Coturnix* Bonnaterre, 1790 ;
- (c) *Egretta* Forster, 1817 ;
- (d) *Oriolus* Linnaeus, 1766 ;

- (3) place the under-mentioned generic names on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* :—

- (a) the four generic names specified in (1) above, as there proposed to be suppressed under the plenary powers ;
- (b) *Bubo* Rambur, 1842 (Roret's *Suite à Buffon*), *Nevropteres* : 353 ;
- (c) *Coturnix* Nozeman & Vosmaer, 1858, *Geslacht. Vogel*. (Dutch trans. of Moehring, 1758, *Avium Genera*) **3** : 39 (a work which has already been ruled unavailable for nomenclatorial purposes).

**PROPOSED USE OF THE PLENARY POWERS TO SUPPRESS THE NAME "GALLINAGO" BRISSON, 1760 (CLASS AVES), AND PROPOSED SUBSTITUTION OF "CAPELLA" FRENZEL, 1801, FOR "GALLINAGO" KOCH, 1816, ON THE "OFFICIAL LIST OF GENERIC NAMES IN ZOOLOGY" (PROPOSED CORRECTION OF AN ERRONEOUS ENTRY IN "OPINION" 67)**

By FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E.

(Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)575)

The subject matter of the present application came to notice in the course of the checking of the entries on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* in connection with the projected publication of the *Official List* in book form and is concerned with the generic name *Gallinago* Koch, 1816 (*Syst. baier. Zool.* 1:312) which was placed on the *Official List* in *Opinion* 67 published in 1916 (*Smithson. Publ.* 2409:180).

2. The generic name *Gallinago* Koch, 1816, was stated in *Opinion* 67 to have as its type species, *Scolopax gallinoga* Linnaeus, 1758 (*Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) 1:147) by absolute tautonymy, through the "*media* of Koch" (i.e. *Gallinago media* Koch, 1816, *loc. cit.* 1:314). This name was therefore a generic name applied to the Common Snipe.

3. When checking this part of *Opinion* 67, I observed that Hartert, after using the generic name *Gallinago* Koch for the Snipe in the main portion of his work relating to the genus concerned (Hartert, 1916, *Vögel paläarkt. Fauna* (2):1655), had later in the same work (1921, *ibid.* (3):2213) published a correction, pointing out that *Gallinago* Koch was a junior synonym of *Capella* Frenzel, 1801 (*Beschr. Vögel Wittenberg*:58), the type species of which was the nominal species *Capella coelestis* Frenzel, 1801 (*ibid.*:58), a nominal species which represented the same taxonomic species as did the nominal species *Scolopax gallinago* Linnaeus. I noted also that my colleague Commissioner James L. Peters (1934, *Check List Birds World* 2:274) accepted the name *Capella* Frenzel, sinking *Gallinago* Koch as a synonym.

4. As it was clearly not possible in these circumstances to leave the name *Gallinago* Koch on the *Official List* without prior resubmission to the International Commission, I wrote a letter (on 14th October 1945) to Dr. Peters asking for his views as to the action which it was desirable should be taken. Dr. Peters in his reply (of 6th December 1945) wrote:—"After *Capella* Frenzel was shown to be an earlier name than *Gallinago* Koch and of equal applicability, it was immediately adopted and is now in current use for the different species of Snipe. For this reason I believe the *Gallinago* should be expunged from the *Official List* and *Capella* substituted in its place. No useful purpose would be served by reinstating *Gallinago* Koch under suspension of the rules and suppressing *Capella*."

5. Quite recently I was led, for the reasons which I have explained in Application Z.N.(S.)701 (relating to the generic names *Bubo*, *Coturnix*, *Egretta*, and *Oriolus*)\* to examine carefully M. J. Brisson's *Ornithologie* published in 1760, for I had already discovered that one name (*Egretta* Forster, 1817) that was already on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* was an invalid junior homonym of a totally overlooked name published in Brisson's *Ornithologie*. This search brought to light the existence of the name *Gallinago* Brisson, 1760 (*Ornithologie* 5 : 298-310), which thus greatly antedates the name *Capella* Frenzel, 1801. The name *Gallinago* was used by Brisson as the name for a subdivision of the genus *Scolopax*; he placed in it all except the first of the five species which he referred to *Scolopax*. All the species described in the *Ornithologie* are described initially under a French name, followed by a Latin diagnosis, at the end of which is given, in different type, the Latin name accepted by Brisson for the species in question, this in turn being followed, in the case of previously described species, by a detailed synonymy. The first of the species placed by Brisson in his *Gallinago* was cited under the French name "La Beccassine," the scientific name at the end of the Latin diagnosis being given simply as "*Gallinago*" (not because Brisson was a mononominalist, but because he customarily cited in this way the names of species when the "species" portion of the name consisted of the same word (i.e. was a single word) tautonymous with the generic name). In the synonymy of this species Brisson quoted the diagnosis given by Linnaeus in 1758 for his *Scolopax gallinago*, finishing this quotation as follows:—" *Gallinago*. *Linn. Syst. Nat.* ed. 10 *Gen.* 77 *sp.* 11 " (*Scolopax* being the 77th genus of birds in the 10th edition of the *Syst. Nat.* and *Scolopax gallinago* being the eleventh of the species referred by Linnaeus to this genus). Thus, we see clearly that this species is *Scolopax gallinago* Linnaeus, 1758 (: 147) and that, as its trivial name is tautonymous with the generic name selected by Brisson, it is the type species of *Gallinago* Brisson by absolute tautonymy. Accordingly, the name *Gallinago* Brisson, 1760, is not only a senior homonym of *Gallinago* Koch, 1816, but in addition is a senior synonym of Koch's generic name, Brisson's and Koch's nominal genera each having the same nominal species as its type species. The position so established created a new situation and one under which the entry on the *Official List* relating to *Gallinago* Koch was not only (as previously) subjectively defective (because of the subjective identification of the nominal species which are respectively the type species of *Capella* Frenzel, 1801, and of *Gallinago* Koch, 1816), but also objectively incorrect (through *Gallinago* Koch, being both an objective junior homonym, and an objective junior synonym, of *Gallinago* Brisson, 1760). Faced with this situation, it seemed to me that, since (as Dr. Peters had explained) the name *Capella* Frenzel had by now completely replaced the name *Gallinago* Koch, it would be confusing if now that transition had to be reversed, the name *Capella* Frenzel being displaced by *Gallinago* Brisson.

6. At this stage I consulted Colonel Richard Meinertzhagen, Chairman of the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature who in his reply (dated 12th September 1952) wrote as follows: "If, as at first appeared, the question to be considered in the case of the name *Gallinago* had been whether the name *Gallinago* Koch, 1816, should be replaced on the *Official List* by its

\*See pp. 82-92 of the present volume.



senior subjective synonym *Capella* Frenzel, 1801, I should have been strongly in favour of that course, for now that *Gallinago* Koch has been completely replaced by the name *Capella* Frenzel, I should have thought it most unfortunate if, through *Gallinago* Koch being already on the *Official List*, it had been necessary to abandon current practice by reverting to the use of the name *Gallinago* Koch. Now that it appears that the oldest generic name for the Common Snipe is *Gallinago* Brisson, 1760, I hold the same view for the same reason. I accordingly consider that the best course will be for the International Commission to suppress Brisson's *Gallinago*, to remove Koch's *Gallinago* from the *Official List* and to insert in its place the name *Capella* Frenzel. The trivial name *gallinago* Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the combination *Scolopax gallinago*) should, I agree, now be placed on the *Official List of Specific Trivial Names*. Naturally, however, the trivial name *coelestis* Frenzel, 1801 (the trivial name of the type species of *Capella* Frenzel) ought not to be placed on that *Official List*, for, although nomenclatorially it is an available name, it is only a junior synonym of *gallinago* Linnaeus and therefore can never be needed."

7. A settlement of this case is urgently required, for at present the problem presented by the name *Gallinago* Koch represents one of the obstacles which is holding up the publication of the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* in book form. In view of the advice received in this case—as set out in paragraphs 4 and 6 above—I recommend that the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature should :—

- (1) use its plenary powers to suppress the generic name *Gallinago* Brisson, 1760, for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy ;
- (2) delete the name *Gallinago* Koch, 1816, from the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*, at the same time correcting *Opinion* 67 to the extent necessary ;
- (3) substitute on the foregoing *Official List* the name *Capella* Frenzel, 1801 (type species, by monotypy : *Capella coelestis* Frenzel, 1801) for the name proposed, under (2) above, to be removed therefrom ;
- (4) place the trivial name *gallinago* Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the combination *Scolopax gallinago*) on the *Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology* ;
- (5) place the under-mentioned names on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* :—
  - (a) *Gallinago* Brisson, 1760, as proposed, under (1) above, to be suppressed under the plenary powers ;
  - (b) *Gallinago* Koch, 1816 (junior homonym, of *Gallinago* Brisson, 1760) ;
  - (c) *Capella* Keyserling & Blasius, 1840, *Wirbelth. Europas* 1 : 9 (junior homonym of *Capella* Frenzel, 1801).

**PROPOSED ADDITION TO THE "OFFICIAL LIST OF SPECIFIC TRIVIAL NAMES IN ZOOLOGY" OF THE TRIVIAL NAME "SYRIACUS" ROTHSCILD, 1910 (AS PUBLISHED IN THE COMBINATION "STRUTHIO CAMELUS SYRIACUS"), THE TRIVIAL NAME OF THE SYRIAN OSTRICH (CLASS AVES)**

By R. MEINERTZHAGEN, D.S.O. (*London*)

**(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)633)**

The object of the present application is to ask the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to place on the *Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology* the trivial name *syriacus* Rothschild, 1910 (as published in the combination *Struthio camelus syriacus*), the trivial name of the Syrian Ostrich.

**2. The relevant facts in regard to this case are as follows :—**

- (1) The Ostrich was named *Struthio camelus* by Linnaeus in 1758 (*Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) **1** : 587). Linnaeus gave "Syria, Arabia, Libya and Africa" as the localities for this bird. In addition, he gave bibliographical references to Aldrovandus, Dodart, Seba, Willughby and Albin. The localities given for the Ostrich by the authorities cited by Linnaeus were : (1) Syria, Sind, Arabia, Libya and Arguin Island, Mauretania (Aldrovandus, through older authors cited) ; (2) Cape of Good Hope (Seba) ; (3) Africa and Arabia (Willughby) ; (4) Deserts of Arabia and Africa (Albin). No locality was specified by Dodart.
- (2) It is clear from the particulars given above that, from the point of view of the particulars given in 1758, the nominal species *Struthio camelus* comprised what are now regarded as several distinct subspecies of the Ostrich.
- (3) In 1910 the late Lord Rothschild (*Bull. brit. ornith. Club* **39** : 83) gave "North Africa" as the type locality for nominotypical *Struthio camelus camelus* and published the name *Struthio camelus syriacus* for the Syrian Ostrich, which has accordingly been known by that name for the last thirty-two years.
- (4) Quite recently (1951, *Bull. brit. ornith. Club* **71** : 45-46) Grant and Mackworth-Praed have advanced the view that "Syria," as being the first of the localities cited by Linnaeus must be regarded as the type locality of nominotypical *Struthio camelus* Linnaeus, 1758 ; they accordingly sink the trivial name *syriacus* Rothschild, 1910, as an objective synonym of nominotypical *camelus* Linnaeus, and, having thus left the North African Ostrich without an available name, give it the name *Struthio camelus rothschildi* "new race." The type locality is given as "Marandet, south Air or Azibine, Niger district, French West Africa." The holotype is an adult male in the collection of the British Museum (Natural History).

3. Captain Grant and Mr. Mackworth-Praed kindly showed me their note before it was published. I then took strong exception to the action proposed, for, in my view, if an author, when naming a new species, cites several localities, subsequent authors are free to select any of those localities as the type locality of the nominotypical subspecies, provided that the original author did not specify a type specimen. Moreover, I consider it the duty of systematists to retain names (such as *syriacus* Rothschild) which have been in use for a generation or more, if this can possibly be done. In this particular case it could not even be urged that the abandonment of the name *syriacus* Rothschild and the renaming of the North African Ostrich was required under a strict application of the *Règles*, for there is no provision in the *Règles* regulating the selection of a type locality from among a series of localities cited in the original description of a species. The action described above is therefore peculiarly unjustified and, if not quashed, will inevitably lead to confusion. At the same time that Grant and Praed's paper was published, I published a short note (*ibid.* 71 : 46), protesting against their action in rejecting the name *syriacus* Rothschild for the Syrian Ostrich. I was very glad to see that in a paper published this year (*Auk*. 69 : 343) the late Dr. James L. Peters supported my protest, writing: Meinertzhagen "objects (and quite rightly) to the action of Grant and Mackworth-Praed in rejecting *S. c. syriacus*."

4. It is a serious weakness in the *Règles* that they contain no provision for regulating the selection of type localities and thus for preventing confusion of the kind described above from arising. It is very much to be hoped that this omission will be repaired by the Copenhagen Congress in 1953 when it resumes the discussions begun in Paris in 1948 for securing greater stability in zoological nomenclature. In the meantime effective action can be taken only by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature and it is for this reason that I am submitting the present application.

5. My general purpose is to secure a ruling in favour of the maintenance of the name *syriacus* Rothschild for the Syrian Ostrich and of the name *camelus* Linnaeus for the North African Ostrich. It would be desirable that the same opportunity should be taken for granting formal recognition of the selection of "Sennar" as the type locality of nominotypical *camelus* made by Stresemann in 1926 (*Orn. Monatsber.* 1926 : 139).

6. The proposal which I accordingly submit to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is that it should :—

place the under-mentioned trivial names on the *Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology* :—

- (i) *syriacus* Rothschild, 1910 (as published in the combination *Struthio camelus syriacus*), with type locality "Syrian desert" as designated by Rothschild ;
- (ii) *camelus* Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the combination *Struthio camelus*), with type locality "Sennar", as selected by Stresemann in 1926).



**PROPOSED USE OF THE PLENARY POWERS TO SUPPRESS THE NAME "TYRANNULA" SWAINSON, 1827, AND TO DESIGNATE A TYPE SPECIES FOR "MYIOBIUS" DARWIN, 1839 (CLASS AVES)**

By JOHN T. ZIMMER

(*The American Museum of Natural History, New York*)

**(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)676)**

The object of the present application is to ask the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to use its plenary powers to vary the normal operation of the Rules for the purpose of preventing the confusion and disturbance in long established nomenclatural practice if those rules were to be applied strictly to the names *Tyrannula* Swainson, 1827, and *Myiobius* Darwin, 1839 (Class Aves).

2. The relevant facts concerning the foregoing names are as follows. Darwin published the name *Myiobius* (July 1839, *Zool. Voy. "Beagle"* 3(9): 46) to replace the name *Tyrannula* Swainson, 1827, which he regarded as an invalid junior homonym of *Tyrannulus* Vieillot, 1816 (*Analyse*: 31). Darwin did not designate a type species for *Myiobius*, but in 1840 Gray (G. R.) (*List Gen. Birds*: 30) selected *Muscicapa "barbatus"* Gmelin (i.e. *Muscicapa barbata* Gmelin, 1788, in Linnaeus, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 13) 1: 933) as the type species of this genus. At the same time Gray, following Darwin, placed *Tyrannula* Swainson in the synonymy both of *Myiobius* Darwin and of *Pyrocephalus* Gould, [1839].

3. The foregoing arrangement has been followed by subsequent workers with little disagreement, and *Myiobius* has been current for over a century. One of the decisions taken by the International Congress of Zoology (on the recommendation of the Commission) at Paris in 1948, though, in itself, quite acceptable, has, however, introduced a complication in the present case, which, if not remedied in the manner now suggested, would have objectionable results. The decision in question was that under which a generic name published before 1st January, 1931, is to be accepted as having been published with an indication, if the names of previously established species are cited under the new generic name, even if no description of any kind was given for the new genus (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 4: 80).

4. The generic name *Tyrannula* was first published by Swainson with a formal description in a paper published in December 1827 (*Zool. J.* 3: 358). Among the species referred to *Tyrannula* in this paper was *Muscicapa barbata* Gmelin, which (as already noted) Gray later selected as the type species of the substitute genus *Myiobius* Darwin, thereby establishing it also as the type species of *Tyrannula* Swainson, if the paper of December 1827 had been the first valid publication of that name. Unfortunately, however, the December paper was preceded by another published in May 1827 (*Phil. Mag.* (n.s.) 1(5)

*Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, Vol: 9 (October 1952)

367-368). (One aspect of the problem raised by the May paper was dealt with by the Commission in its *Opinion* 30, published in 1911 (*Smithson. Publ.* 2013 : 69-72).) In this paper Swainson used the name *Tyrannula* for eight species but did not provide a generic description. Of the eight species then referred to *Tyrannula*, five were then described for the first time, two were cited from Gmelin, and one was described but tentatively identified with one of Vieillot's earlier described species. Under the new ruling referred to above, the name *Tyrannula* Swainson of May 1827 is an available name, since its components were specified by the original author. The species *Muscicapa barbata* Gmelin was not among the species placed by Swainson in the genus *Tyrannula* in May 1827 and it cannot therefore be accepted as the type species of this genus. No other species has however been suggested to fill that role.

5. Contrary to the view held by Darwin and later by Gray, the name *Tyrannula* Swainson is not a homonym of *Tyrannulus* Vieillot and is, in fact, an available name. Under normal procedures, its type species must be one or other of the eight species cited by Swainson in his paper of May 1827. This would however involve three highly undesirable elements. First, although the exact specific identity of two of these species is uncertain, it seems probable that they, like the other six, belong to one or other of the genera now known as *Myiarchus*, *Contopus*, *Empidonax*, *Myiozetetes*, and *Pyrocephalus*. All these genera were established after 1827, and the selection as the type species of *Tyrannula* of any of the eight species referred to that genus by Swainson in May 1827 would therefore necessitate the replacement of one of these long-established names. Second, the selection of any of these species as the type species of *Tyrannula* would involve the proposal of a new name for the century-old genus *Myiobius* Darwin. Third, confusion would be bound to arise if the names *Tyrannula* Swainson and *Tyrannulus* Vieillot were both valid names for genera in the same family.

6. The name *Myiobius* Darwin was unquestionably proposed as a substitute name for *Tyrannula* Swainson (though of what date is uncertain) and it would be undesirable to disregard the method by which it was proposed, more especially in view of the fact that Darwin did not cite *Muscicapa barbata* Gmelin under his *Myiobius*, and, in consequence, Gray's selection of that species as the type species of this genus would in that event be unacceptable. Moreover, none of the species which were cited by Darwin under *Myiobius* is now considered to belong to this genus. The six species in question are now distributed among five genera, of which only one (*Elaenia* Sundevall [1836]) is older than *Myiobius* but more recent than *Tyrannula*. There is moreover nothing in Darwin's account to suggest that he and Gould considered the proposed *Myiobius* as having special application to *barbata* Gmelin, except through *Tyrannula* Swainson.

7. Since the strict application of the normal rules in the Code would involve several changes in old, established generic names and would leave in the same family two generic names differing only in endings of gender, I believe that this is a case where the International Commission should use its plenary powers to set aside the ordinary rules and maintain the existing accepted nomenclature in this group.

8. I accordingly recommend the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature :—

(1) to use its plenary powers :—

- (a) to suppress the generic name *Tyrannula* Swainson, May 1827, for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy ;
- (b) to set aside all selections of type species made prior to the decision now proposed to be taken for the genus *Myiobius* Darwin, 1839, and, having done so, to designate *Muscicapa barbata* Gmelin, 1788, to be the type species of the foregoing genus ;

- (2) to place the name *Myiobius* Darwin, 1839 (type species, by designation under the plenary powers, as proposed in (1)(b) above : *Muscicapa barbata* Gmelin, 1788) on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* ;
- (3) to place the name *Tyrannula* Swainson, May 1827, as proposed, under (1)(a) above, to be suppressed under the plenary powers, on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* ;
- (4) to place the trivial name *barbata* Gmelin, 1788 (as published in the binominal combination *Muscicapa barbata*) on the *Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology*.



**SUPPORT FOR THE PROPOSAL FOR THE USE OF THE PLENARY POWERS  
TO SUPPRESS THE GENERIC NAME "TYRANNULA" SWAINSON, 1827  
(CLASS AVES)**

By the

STANDING COMMITTEE ON ORNITHOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE OF  
THE INTERNATIONAL ORNITHOLOGICAL CONGRESS

**(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)676)**

(Letter, dated 22nd July 1952, from Colonel Richard Meinertzhagen, Chairman of  
the Standing Committee)

The Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature appointed by the International Ornithological Congress has had under consideration an application submitted to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature by Dr. John T. Zimmer in which the Commission is asked to use its plenary powers for the purpose of securing the continued availability of the generic name *Myiobius* Darwin, 1839.

The Standing Committee are of the opinion that it would be highly undesirable that the well-known name *Myiobius* Darwin should be replaced by the name *Tyrannula*, 1827, and desire to support the proposal that, in order to prevent the confusion which would follow from the application of the normal rules in this case, the Commission should use its plenary powers in the manner proposed, that is, for the purpose of suppressing the name *Tyrannula* Swainson and for designating *Muscicapa barbata* Gmelin, 1788, to be the type species of *Myiobius* Darwin, 1839, thereby preserving that name for use in its accustomed sense.

The foregoing recommendation has the unanimous support of all the members of the Standing Committee, namely, J. Berlioz (*Museum National d'Histoire Naturelle, Paris*); Erwin Stresemann (*Zoologisches Museum der Universität, Berlin*); John T. Zimmer (*The American Museum of Natural History, New York*) (the applicant in the present case) and myself.

**REQUEST FOR A RULING THAT THE TRIVIAL NAMES  
OF TWO WOODPECKERS, EACH CONSISTING OF A  
SLIGHT VARIANT OF A PREVIOUSLY PUBLISHED NAME  
BASED UPON A WORD TRANSLITERATED INTO THE  
LATIN ALPHABET FROM A LANGUAGE USING ANOTHER  
ALPHABET, BE TREATED AS JUNIOR HOMONYMS OF  
THE EARLIER NAMES SO PUBLISHED**

By the Marquess HACHISUKA

(Atami, Shizuoka Ken, Japan)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)678)

The purpose of the present application is to ask the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to give a ruling that the trivial names of two woodpeckers, each consisting of a slight variant of a previously published name based upon a word transliterated into the Latin alphabet from a language using another alphabet, are to be treated as junior homonyms of the earlier names so published. From the point of view of Japanese ornithologists the first of these cases is a matter of some urgency for the decennial revision of the *Handlist of the Japanese Birds* is now in preparation and it is particularly desired that the correct names for these birds should be used in it.

2. The birds concerned are now regarded as belonging to the genus *Picoides* Lacépède, 1799. The birds involved in the first case were originally described from material from the island of Sakhalin, the second from the Tianshan area. The names in question are the following :—

- (1) *Dryobates leucotos saghalinensis* Yamashina, 1931 (*Tori* 7 : 1) becomes congeneric with *Picoides tridactylus sakhalinensis* Buterlin, 1907 (*Orn. Monatsber.* 15 : 10) on the union of *Dendrocopos* Koch, 1816 with *Picoides* Lacépède, 1799.
- (2) *Dendrocopus* [sic] *major tianshanicus* Buterlin, 1910 (*Orn. Mitt., Moskau* 1910 (3) : 200) becomes congeneric with *Picoides tridactylus tianshanicus* Buterlin, 1907 (*Orn. Monatsber.* 15 : 9) on the union of the genus *Dendrocopos* Koch, 1816, with the genus *Picoides* Lacépède, 1799.

3. There is no authoritative approved spelling either for the word used to denote the Island of Sakhalin or Saghalien, or for the word used as the name of the Tianshan or Tianshan Mountains. Both these names are based upon place names used in languages using alphabets other than the Latin alphabet and in existing circumstances it is not possible to establish that a Latinised version of these place names spelt in one way is more correct than that spelt in another way. Slight variations in spelling due to differences in transliteration are not open to any serious objection in the case of trivial names, where the species concerned are referred to different genera. The question does however become one of consequence when two species or subspecies in the same genus bear names that are essentially identical with one another, differing, in form, only through slight difference in transliteration. In the present instance, it would clearly be most

*Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, Vol. 9 (October 1952)

confusing if in the same genus there were birds, whose valid names were respectively *saghalinensis* and *sakhalinensis* or *tianshanicus* and *tianschanicus*. Moreover, it would impose a quite unreasonable strain upon Article 34 of the *Règles* (as amended in Paris in 1948) to argue that the foregoing do not represent pairs of homonyms, merely because of the difficulty arising from the fact that we are concerned here not with true Latin words but with Latinised versions of words transcribed from other alphabets. I accordingly ask the International Commission to rule that, under Articles 19 and 34, read together, the words of which the foregoing pairs of names are composed are to be treated as homonyms of one another.

4. The request now actually submitted is that the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature should :—

(1) rule that the following pairs of variant spellings are to be treated as homonyms of one another :—

(a) *saghalinensis* and *sakhalinensis* :

(b) *tianshanicus* and *tianschanicus* :

(2) place the following trivial names on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Trivial Names in Zoology* :—

(a) *saghalinensis* Yamashima, 1931 (as published in the combination *Dryobates leucotos saghalinensis*) (invalid as a junior secondary homonym consequent upon the reference to the genus *Picoides* Lacépède, 1799, both of *Dryobates leucotos saghalinensis* Yamashima, 1931, and of *Picoides tridactylus sakhalinensis* Butlerin, 1907) ;

(b) *tianshanicus* Butlerin, 1910 (as published in the combination *Dendrocopus* [sic] *major tianshanicus*) (invalid as a junior secondary homonym consequent upon the reference to the genus *Picoides* Lacépède, 1799, both of *Dendrocopus major tianshanicus* Butlerin, 1910, and of *Picoides tridactylus tianschanicus* Butlerin, 1907).

**Note by the Secretary to the Commission :** It will be convenient in connection with the application submitted by the Marquess Hachisuka to recall that Dr. Helen Muir-Wood has already submitted an application (Z.N.(S.)530) which, though primarily concerned with the relative status of the names *Jakowleffia* Puton, 1875, and *Yakovlevia* Fredericks, 1925 (1951, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 6 : 90-92), raises a general question of principle essentially identical with that raised in the present application by the Marquess Hachisuka. For the only difference is that Dr. Muir-Wood's application is concerned with scientific names based upon the names of persons, while that of the Marquess Hachisuka is concerned with scientific names based upon the names of places or geographical features. It will, no doubt, be to the general convenience if both these aspects of this general problem are dealt with simultaneously by the Commission rather than that they should be treated as constituting separate problems. (signed) Francis Hemming. 24th September 1952.



**PROPOSED USE OF THE PLENARY POWERS TO SUPPRESS THE TRIVIAL NAME "CYANEA" VIEILLLOT, 1818 (AS PUBLISHED IN THE COMBINATION "MUSCICAPA CYANEA") FOR THE PURPOSE OF VALIDATING THE TRIVIAL NAME "CYANEA" HUME, 1877 (AS PUBLISHED IN THE COMBINATION "MUSCITREA CYANEA") (CLASS AVES)**

By CHARLES VAURIE

(The American Museum of Natural History, New York)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)686)

The object of the present application is to ask the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to use its plenary powers for the purpose of suppressing the trivial name *cyanea* Vieillot, 1818 (as published in the binominal combination *Muscicapa cyanea*), thus validating in the genus *Niltava* Hodgson, 1837 (*India Rev.* 1 : 650) the trivial name *cyanea* Hume, 1877 (as published in the binominal combination *Muscitrea cyanea*) (Class Aves). The details of this case are set out below.

2. The species represented by the nominal species *Muscicapa cyanea* Vieillot, 1818 (*Nouv. Dict. Hist. nat.* 21 : 447) is said to come from Timor and appears from Vieillot's description to be the same species as that which later was given the name *Muscicapa hyacinthina* Temminck, 1820 (*in* Temminck & Laugier, *Nouv. Rec. Planches color. Ois.* (5) : pl. 30, figs. 1, 2). The name given to it by Vieillot, which has never been used for it or cited in connection with it in the literature since the time of its original publication, is invalid, being a junior primary homonym of *Muscicapa cyanea* Müller, [1776] (*in* Linnaeus, *Syst. Nat. Suppl.* : 170).

3. The bird to which Hume in 1877 (*Stray Feathers* 5 : 101) gave the name *Muscitrea cyanea* is now treated as belonging to the genus *Niltava* Hodgson. Accordingly, there are now in that genus two species, each possessing the trivial name *cyanea*, namely (1) Temminck's *hyacinthina*, which, as explained above, has *cyanea* Vieillot in its synonymy, and (2) Hume's *cyanea*. Under the normal operation of the Rules, the latter name, as a junior secondary homonym, must be rejected as invalid. This name has however been in unchallenged use for about 75 years for the well-known Indian bird concerned and is the name that has been used for that bird in every standard work published during that period. The rejection of this name at this stage would lead to confusion and disturbance, unaccompanied by any corresponding benefit.

4. The International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is accordingly asked :—

- (1) to use its plenary powers for the purpose of suppressing the trivial name *cyanea* Vieillot, 1818 (as published in the binominal combination *Muscicapa cyanea*) for the purposes of the Law of Homonymy ;

(2) to place the under-mentioned trivial names on the *Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology* :—

(a) *cyanea* Hume, 1877 (as published in the binominal combination *Muscitrea cyanea*) ;

(b) *cyanea* Müller, 1776 (as published in the binominal combination *Muscicapa cyanea*) ;

(c) *hyacinthina* Temminck, 1820 (as published in the binominal combination *Muscicapa hyacinthina*) ;

(3) to place the trivial name *cyanea* Vieillot, 1818 (as published in the binominal combination *Muscicapa cyanea*), as proposed, under (1) above, to be suppressed under the plenary powers, on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Trivial Names in Zoology*.

**PROPOSED USE OF THE PLENARY POWERS TO VALIDATE THE TRIVIAL NAME "FERRUGINEA" HODGSON, 1845 (AS PUBLISHED IN THE COMBINATION "HEMICHELIDON FERRUGINEA") BY THE SUPPRESSION OF THE TRIVIAL NAME "FERRUGINEA" MERREM, 1784 (AS PUBLISHED IN THE COMBINATION "MUSCICAPA FERRUGINEA") (CLASS AVES)**

By CHARLES VAURIE

(*The American Museum of Natural History, New York*)

**(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)687)**

The object of the present application is to ask the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to use its plenary powers to preserve the trivial name *ferruginea* Hodgson, 1845 (as published in the binominal combination *Hemichelidon ferruginea*) (Class Aves). The details of this case are set out below.

2. The species, which was treated as belonging to the genus *Hemichelidon* when it was first described and named *Hemichelidon ferruginea* Hodgson, 1845 (*Proc. zool. Soc. Lond.* **13**(146) : 32) is now placed in the genus *Muscicapa* Linnaeus, 1766. There is however a much older nominal species originally described as belonging to the genus *Muscicapa*, namely *Muscicapa ferruginea* Merrem, 1784 (*Avium rar. Icones* **1** : 19). Thus, the trivial name *ferruginea* Hodgson, 1845, is invalid, as a junior secondary homonym in the genus *Muscicapa*.

3. Merrem's work is not available to me, but according to a personal communication which I have received from Mr. H. G. Deignan (*U.S. National Museum, Washington*), both the species represented by *Muscicapa ferruginea* Merrem and its country of origin is uncertain. On the other hand, the bird to which Hodgson gave the name *Hemichelidon ferruginea* has been known by the

trivial name *ferruginea* for 107 years and has been cited under that name by the authors of all standard works (Hartert 1910, *Die Vög. Paläarkt. Fauna* **1** : 479 ; Stuart Baker, *Faun. Brit. Ind.* ; R. B. Sharpe, *Cat. Birds Brit. Mus.* **4** : 122 ; F. N. Chasen, 1935, *Handlist of Malaysian Birds* : 163).

4. Great and quite unnecessary confusion and disturbance would be created by the rejection of the trivial name *ferruginea* Hodgson by reason of its being a junior secondary homonym in the genus *Muscicapa* of the trivial name *ferruginea* Merrem. This would be all the less justified in view of the fact that the name published by Merrem is a *nomen dubium*. It is to prevent this disturbance that this case is now submitted to the International Commission under the procedure prescribed by the International Congress of Zoology for dealing with problems presented by *nomina dubia* (1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 76).

5. The application now submitted is that the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature should :—

- (1) use its plenary powers (a) to suppress the trivial name *ferruginea* Merrem, 1784 (as published in the binominal combination *Muscicapa ferruginea*) for the purposes both of the Law of Priority and of the Law of Homonymy, and (b) to validate the trivial name *ferruginea* Hodgson, 1845 (as published in the binominal combination *Hemichelidon ferruginea*) ;
- (2) place the trivial name *ferruginea* Hodgson, 1845 (as published in the foregoing combination), as validated, under (1)(b) above, under the plenary powers, on the *Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology* ;
- (3) place the under-mentioned trivial names on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Trivial Names in Zoology* :—
  - (a) *ferruginea* Merrem, 1784 (as published in the binominal combination *Muscicapa ferruginea*), as proposed, under (1)(a) above, to be suppressed under the plenary powers ;
  - (b) *ferrugineas* Hodgson, June 1844 (as published in the binominal combination *Hemichelidon ferruginea* Hodgson, 1844, Gray's *Zool. Miscell.* (6) : 84) (a *nomen nudum*).



# CONTENTS

(continued from front wrapper)

## New Applications

	Page
(1) <i>Colymbus</i> Linnaeus, 1758 : (a) application for suppression of, and for validation of <i>Gavia</i> Forster, 1788, under the plenary powers, by the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature ; (b) Report of position of, under Règles, the by Francis Hemming, <i>Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature</i> .. .. .	4
(2) Trivial name <i>caspicus</i> Hablizl, 1783 (as published in the combination <i>Colymbus caspicus</i> ), proposed suppression of, under the plenary powers. By the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature .. .. .	30
(3) Four trivial names published for birds by Lichtenstein in 1793, proposed suppression of, under the plenary powers. By the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature .. .. .	32
(4) Trivial name <i>nortoniensis</i> Gmelin, 1789 (as published in the combination <i>Fringilla nortoniensis</i> ), proposed suppression of, under the plenary powers. By the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature .. .. .	38
(5) Seven trivial names published by Gmelin in 1788 and 1789 for birds which remained unidentified until 1950, proposed suppression of, under the plenary powers. Application by the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature .. .. .	40
(6) Three trivial names for birds published by Forster (J.R.) in 1794, proposed suppression of, under the plenary powers ; also proposed suppression under those powers of the trivial name <i>novaehollandiae</i> Latham, 1790 (as published in the combination <i>Muscicapa novaehollandiae</i> ). (a) application by H. M. Whittle ( <i>for Checklist Committee, Royal Australasian Ornithologists' Union</i> ) ; (b) application by four United States ornithologists (Ernst Mayr <i>et al.</i> ) and three Australian ornithologists (L. Clavert <i>et al.</i> ) ; (c) note by Francis Hemming, <i>Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature</i> ; (d) support by the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature .. .. .	44
(7) Three trivial names of birds, proposed acceptance, under Article 19, of emendations made for. By the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature .. .. .	52
(8) <i>Pyrrhonorax</i> Tunstall, 1771, proposed validation of, under the plenary powers : (a) application by the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature ; (b) note by Francis Hemming, <i>Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature</i> .. .. .	53
(9) Trivial name of the Song Thrush, proposed validation of <i>philomelos</i> Brehm, 1831 (as published in the combination <i>Turdus philomelos</i> ) as the trivial name for. By the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature .. .. .	62
(10) Names for American birds published by Linnaeus in 1776 and completely overlooked until 1949, proposed suppression of, under the plenary powers. (a) application by the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature, covering an application by nine United States ornithologists (E. R. Blake <i>et al.</i> ) ; (b) note by Francis Hemming, <i>Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature</i> .. .. .	65
(11) Report by Francis Hemming ( <i>Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature</i> ) on the type species of certain genera of birds discussed but left unsettled, in <i>Opinion</i> 16 : support for action proposed received from Colonel R. Meinertzhagen .. .. .	70

# CONTENTS

(continued from overleaf)

	Page
(12) Two Siberian birds, proposed addition of trivial names of, to the <i>Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology</i> . By the late James L. Peters ( <i>Museum of Comparative Zoology, Cambridge, Mass, U.S.A.</i> ) .. .. .	77
(13 to 17) Proposals for the correction of errors relating to the names of birds placed on the <i>Official List of Generic Names in Zoology in Opinion 67</i> . By Francis Hemming, <i>Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature</i> :	
(a) <i>Ectopistes</i> Swainson, 1827 : validation of <i>Columba migratoria</i> Linnaeus, 1766, as name of type species of .. .. .	80
(b) <i>Balaeniceps</i> Gould : correction of date of publication of, and reference for .. .. .	85
(c) <i>Oedipodites</i> Temminck, 1815, proposed substitution of <i>Burhinus</i> Illiger, 1811, for .. .. .	86
(d) <i>Bubo</i> Duméril, 1806 ; <i>Coturnix</i> Bonnatere, 1790 ; <i>Egretta</i> Forster, 1817 ; <i>Oriolus</i> Linnaeus, 1766 .. .. .	89
(e) <i>Gallinago</i> Koch, 1816, proposed substitution of <i>Capella</i> Frenzel, 1801, for .. .. .	93
(18) Trivial name <i>syriacus</i> Rothschild, 1910 (as published in the combination <i>Struthio camelus syriacus</i> ), proposed addition of, to the <i>Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology</i> as the trivial name of the Syrian Ostrich. By Richard Meinertzhagen ( <i>London</i> ) .. .. .	96
(19) <i>Myiobius</i> Darwin, 1839, proposed validation of, by suppression of <i>Tyrannula</i> Swainson, 1827, and designation of type species for, under the plenary powers. (a) application by John T. Zimmer ( <i>The American Museum of Natural History, New York</i> ) ; (b) support by the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature .. .. .	98
(20) Request for a ruling that the trivial names of two woodpeckers, each consisting of a slight variant of a previously published name based upon a word transliterated into the Latin alphabet from a language using another alphabet, be treated as junior homonyms of the earlier names so published. By the Marquess Hachisuka ( <i>Atami, Shizuoka, Japan</i> ) .. .. .	102
(21) Trivial name <i>cyanea</i> Hume, 1877 (as published in the combination <i>Muscitrea cyanea</i> ), proposed validation of, by suppression of <i>cyanea</i> Vieillot, 1818 (as published in the combination <i>Muscicapa cyanea</i> ) under the plenary powers. By Charles Vaurie ( <i>The American Museum of Natural History, New York</i> ) .. .. .	104
(22) Trivial name <i>ferruginea</i> Hodgson, 1845 (as published in the combination <i>Hemichelidon ferruginea</i> ), proposed validation of, by suppression of <i>ferruginea</i> Merrem, 1784 (as published in the combination <i>Muscicapa ferruginea</i> ) under the plenary powers. By Charles Vaurie ( <i>The American Museum of Natural History, New York</i> ) .. .. .	105